

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

8  
9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 TEDDY BRIAN SANCHEZ,

11 Petitioner,

12 v.

13 KEVIN CHAPPELL, Warden of San Quentin  
14 State Prison,

15 Respondent.

Case No. 1:97-CV-06134-AWI-SAB

DEATH PENALTY CASE

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER (1)  
DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT OF  
HABEAS CORPUS, and (2) ISSUING  
CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY FOR  
CLAIMS 8, 59 AND 61  
(ECF No. 38 )

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR  
EVIDENTIARY HEARING  
(ECF No. 120)

ORDER DENYING MOTION AND  
RENEWED MOTION TO PRESERVE  
TESTIMONY  
(ECF No. 150 & 160)

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR CASE  
MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE  
(ECF No. 159)

ORDER GRANTING REQUEST TO SEAL  
AND PROTECT SUPPLEMENTAL LODGED  
DOCUMENTS  
(ECF No. 162)

CLERK TO FILE DOCUMENTS UNDER  
SEAL

CLERK TO SUBSTITUTE RON DAVIS AS  
RESPONDENT AND ENTER JUDGMENT

1 Petitioner is a state prisoner, sentenced to death, proceeding with a petition for writ of  
2 habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. He is represented in this action by Nina Rivkind,  
3 Esq., California Bar Number 79173, and David Harshaw III, Esq. of the Office of the Federal  
4 Defender.

5 Respondent Kevin Chappell<sup>1</sup> is named as Warden of San Quentin State Prison. He is  
6 represented in this action by Jamie Scheidegger, Esq., and Rachelle Newcomb, Esq., of the  
7 Office of the California Attorney General.

8 Before the court for a decision on the merits is the petition (ECF No. 38). Also before the  
9 Court are Petitioner's motions for evidentiary hearing (ECF No. 120) and to preserve testimony  
10 (ECF No. 150).

11 **I.**

12 **BACKGROUND**

13 Petitioner is currently in the custody of the California Department of Corrections and  
14 Rehabilitation pursuant to a judgment of the Superior Court of California, County of Kern,  
15 following his conviction by court trial on August 3, 1988 of the first degree murders of Juan  
16 Bocanegra ("Mr. Bocanegra") and Juanita Bocanegra ("Mrs. Bocanegra") (Cal. Pen. Code §  
17 187), and of the separate (non-capital) first degree murder of Woodrow Tatman ("Mr. Tatman")  
18 (Cal. Pen. Code § 187). The multiple-murder special-circumstance allegation (Cal. Pen. Code §  
19 190.2, subd. (a)(3)) as to the murders of Mr. Bocanegra and Mrs. Bocanegra was found true.  
20 The trial court also found Petitioner used a deadly and dangerous weapon in the murders of the  
21 Mr. Bocanegra and Mrs. Bocanegra (Cal. Pen. Code § 12022, subd. (b)), and that Petitioner was  
22 guilty of the robbery of Mr. Tatman. (Cal. Pen. Code § 211.)

23 On September 21, 1988, a penalty phase jury was empaneled. During the penalty phase,  
24 the prosecution introduced evidence (see Cal. Pen. Code § 190.3) that in 1982 Petitioner was  
25 involved in the use of, or attempted use of, force or violence against a store owner, Mr.  
26 Ammarie, and against a friend, Mr. Pena. Defendant in turn offered evidence of his  
27

28 <sup>1</sup> Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 25(d), Ron Davis, Acting Warden of San Quentin State Prison, is substituted as Respondent in place of his predecessor wardens.

1 dysfunctional and impoverished upbringing and use of drugs and alcohol and mental issues and  
2 conditions.

3 On October 6, 1988, the jury returned a verdict of death. On October 31, 1988, the trial  
4 court denied Petitioner's motion to modify the verdict (Cal. Pen. Code § 190.4) and sentenced  
5 Petitioner to death for aiding and abetting the stabbing deaths of Mr. & Mrs. Bocanegra; to 25  
6 years to life for the Tatman murder; to 5 years for the Tatman robbery; and to 2 years for the  
7 weapon enhancement.

8 On December 14, 1995, the California Supreme Court affirmed the judgment and  
9 sentence on direct appeal. People v. Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th 1 (1995). The California Supreme  
10 Court denied petition for rehearing but modified its opinion on February 21, 1996. People v.  
11 Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th 825b (1996). Petitioner's petition for writ of certiorari was denied by the  
12 United States Supreme Court on October 7, 1996. Sanchez v. California, 519 U.S. 835 (1996).

13 Petitioner filed a petition for writ of habeas corpus in the California Supreme Court. The  
14 state petition was summarily denied on October 22, 1997. In re Sanchez, S049502.

15 On September 17, 1998, Petitioner filed his federal petition for writ of habeas corpus  
16 arguing insufficient evidence, actual innocence, prosecutorial misconduct and ineffective  
17 assistance of counsel based on allegations he did not assist Joey Bocanegra ("Joey") in killing  
18 Mr. Bocanegra, Joey's father, and that his assistance in the murder of Mrs. Bocanegra, Joey's  
19 mother, does not make him eligible for the death penalty.

20 Respondent filed an answer on October 19, 1998 and an amended answer on February 8,  
21 1999, admitting jurisdictional and procedural allegations (except paragraphs, 1, 16, 18-20),  
22 asserting procedural defenses, and denying all claims 1 through 61.

23 On December 9, 1998, the Court found all claims to be fully exhausted.

24 On April 5, 1999, Petitioner filed a memorandum of points and authorities in support of  
25 the petition. On July 1, 1999, Respondent filed a memorandum of points and authorities in  
26 support of his answer. On August 16, 1999, Petitioner filed a reply to Respondent's  
27 memorandum.

1 Petitioner was granted discovery of law enforcement records relating to: the Bocanegra  
2 crime scene, Petitioner's jail records, jailhouse informants Charles Seeley ("Seeley") and Rufus  
3 Hernandez ("Hernandez"), and coroner Dr. Holloway's autopsy notes. Petitioner was also  
4 authorized to take the deposition of Kern County District Attorney Investigator Dwight  
5 Pendleton regarding Seeley, and the deposition of Bakersfield Police Detective Stratton  
6 regarding Hernandez's heroin use.

7 Petitioner's request to expand the record was granted (ECF No. 134) for Exhibits 144-  
8 151 (declarations), Exhibits 421-434 (law enforcement records), Exhibits 527-528 (depositions),  
9 Exhibits 529-532 (Kern County court records), Exhibits 604-608 (Kern County jail records), and  
10 Exhibits 818-819 (other documents regarding Charles Seeley). Expansion of the record was  
11 denied for Exhibits 524-526 (court orders), but with judicial notice to be taken of proceedings in  
12 the Northern District of California in Ashmus v. Woodford, Case No. C93-0594 THE regarding  
13 the constitutionality of California's death penalty statute.

14 Petitioner filed a motion for evidentiary hearing on March 18, 2003 (ECF No. 120),  
15 seeking a hearing on forty-one of the sixty-one claims in his petition, twenty-six guilt and special  
16 circumstance phase claims and fifteen penalty phase claims.<sup>2</sup>

17 On March 3, 2004, Petitioner filed a second motion to expand the record to rebut  
18 Respondent's arguments in opposition to the motion for evidentiary hearing. The motion to  
19 expand the record was granted on September 27, 2005 (ECF No. 145) as to the supplemental  
20 declaration of defense psychologist, Dr. Froming, and as to records of Mr. Huffman, who was  
21 Petitioner's lawyer on unrelated burglary charges.

22 On June 25, 2014, Petitioner filed a motion to preserve testimony (ECF No. 150), seeking  
23 to depose seven witnesses, each of whom filed a declaration in support of instant petition.  
24 Petitioner filed a renewed motion to preserve testimony on May 1, 2015.

25 On May 1, 2015, Petitioner filed a motion requesting a case management conference  
26

27 

---

<sup>2</sup> The claims for which Petitioner seeks evidentiary hearing are: 2, 4, 6 - 18, 20 - 22, 24, 25, 28, 30 - 34, 36 - 38, 40,  
43 - 48, 50 - 52, 54 and 60.  
28

1 (ECF No. 159) to discuss the above motion for evidentiary hearing.

2 On June 23, 2015, Respondent filed a supplemental notice of lodging newly obtained  
3 state court documents, California Penal Code § 987.9 records # EE through # QQ, (ECF No.  
4 161), and filed notice of his request to seal lodged documents # II and # QQ, (ECF No. 162).

5 **II.**

6 **STATEMENT OF FACTS**

7 This factual summary is taken from the California Supreme Court's summary of the facts  
8 in its December 14, 1995 opinion. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2254(d)(2), (e)(1), the state court's  
9 summary of facts is presumed correct. Petitioner does not present clear and convincing evidence  
10 to the contrary; thus, the Court adopts the factual recitations set forth by the state appellate court.  
11 See Vasquez v. Kirkland, 572 F.3d 1029, 1031 n.1 (9th Cir. 2009) ("We rely on the state  
12 appellate court's decision for our summary of the facts of the crime.").

13 A. *Guilt Phase Facts*

14 1. *The Bocanegra Murders*

15 On the afternoon of February 3, 1987, the police found the bodies of Juan and  
16 Juanita Bocanegra in their home. Juanita was found in her sewing room, and Juan  
17 was found in the kitchen. Both had sustained extensive stab wounds and head  
injuries. A piece of fabric was tied loosely around Juanita's neck, and another  
piece of cloth was found on her right wrist.

18 Kern County Sheriff's criminalist Gregory Laskowski analyzed the blood found at  
19 the scene and concluded that both victims were killed where their bodies were  
20 found. The blood splatter evidence showed that the attack began in the hallway  
near the bathroom. The fight then moved to the kitchen where large amounts of  
blood indicated that a struggle took place throughout the room. The evidence  
indicated a fierce struggle occurred throughout the house. Small amounts of  
diluted blood in the bathroom suggested that someone cleaned up after the attack.

22 Laskowski also found evidence of two types of shoe tracks on the floor of the  
23 Bocanegra kitchen; one print had a "chevron pattern" and another, partial print,  
24 contained a "wavy sole design." A full wavy design shoe track in the bathroom  
was consistent with the print found in the kitchen. Both victims were found  
without shoes; Juanita's bloodstained slippers were found in the hallway.

25 Police found a knife block with four empty spaces in the kitchen. Two knives,  
26 without bloodstains, were in the kitchen sink. There were slash marks on the  
27 cabinets directly above the knife holder. That same evening, the police recovered  
28 a knife and sharpening stone that appeared to have blood on them. No fingerprints  
were found on these items. But police did find a bloody palm print belonging to  
defendant's accomplice Robert Reyes on the doorknob inside the Bocanegra front

1 door. Autopsies performed on both Juan and Juanita revealed that they died as a  
2 result of massive hemorrhaging due to multiple stab wounds, although the type of  
3 instrument that inflicted the wounds could not be conclusively determined.  
4

5 On February 4, 1987, the Bocanegras' Dodge Colt station wagon was found  
6 abandoned. There were extensive bloodstains on both the interior and exterior of  
7 the car. Fingerprints belonging to Joey Bocanegra were found on the interior  
8 driver's and right rear door windows and on the right rear door handle.  
9

10 Two items of evidence linked defendant to the crimes. The missing Bocanegra  
11 television set was found in the same room at the Bakersfield Inn where defendant  
12 stayed at the time of the murders, and defendant sold the Bocanegras' vacuum  
13 cleaner to Maria Rodriguez, a clerk employed by the inn. The remaining evidence  
14 used to convict defendant was based primarily on the circumstances of the crime,  
15 and incriminating statements made by defendant to police investigator Bob  
Stratton, jailhouse informant Rufus Hernandez, and newspaper reporter Michael  
Trihey.  
16

## *2. The Batman Murder*

17 Woodrow Wilson Tatman was a frail, undernourished, 72-year-old man who often  
18 drank alcohol and was confined to a wheelchair. He rented a room at the  
Bakersfield Inn, and spent his days drinking alcohol and watching television.  
Rose McGrew was employed by the inn as a maid and she also lived on the  
premises. She helped care for Tatman and had last been in his room on February  
1, 1987. Maria Charboneau also worked and lived at the inn, and she took care of  
Tatman's Social Security checks, and managed his finances. In the first week of  
February, Tatman received two Social Security checks. On February 2,  
Charboneau gave Tatman between \$80 and \$100. That was the last time she saw  
him alive.  
19

20 On the afternoon of February 4, 1987, McGrew noticed that Tatman's drapes were  
21 still drawn and that he had not yet picked up his mail, which included his Social  
Security check. McGrew entered the room and found Tatman's body, lying on the  
floor near his bed. He was covered with a bedspread. Tatman's television, radio  
and electric skillet were missing from the room.  
22

23 The autopsy report indicated that Tatman was killed by "massive blunt force  
24 injury to the left chest" which collapsed his left lung and caused substantial  
hemorrhaging. The blow to the chest was consistent with a heel stomp or with the  
application of an instrument approximately two inches by three inches in size.  
25

26 Tatman also sustained several superficial stab wounds to the chest and lower  
abdomen, as well as a head injury. It appeared that the superficial injuries had  
27 been inflicted intra or post mortem, and none contributed to death. It could not be  
determined what instrument caused the lower abdominal injuries, although it  
appeared that the chest wounds were inflicted by a screwdriver. Dr. John  
Holloway, the forensic pathologist who performed the autopsy, could not  
determine whether the wounds were caused by one or more individuals.  
28

### *a. Statements Made to Jailhouse Informant Hernandez*

29 Rufus Hernandez was incarcerated with defendant for two months during 1987.  
30 He had been charged with receiving stolen property and second degree burglary.  
31 Defendant spoke to Hernandez about the Bocanegra murders and Hernandez  
32 entered into a plea bargain whereby he received six months in county jail and  
33

1 three years' probation in exchange for his testimony.

2 Hernandez testified that defendant told him he went with Joey Bocanegra to the  
3 Bocanegra house. Hernandez's testimony was inconsistent as to whether  
4 defendant said they went with the plan of robbing the Bocanegras or only with the  
5 plan of borrowing money from Juan Bocanegra. Defendant waited outside for  
6 Joey, but entered the house when he heard Joey and Juan arguing in the hallway.  
7 Defendant claimed he tried unsuccessfully to stop the fight by hitting Juan with a  
8 curved metal bar. He thereafter threw the bar in the front yard. Defendant did not  
9 say whether Joey had stabbed Juan before or after defendant hit him.

10 Juanita, who heard the commotion from another room, came out of the bedroom  
11 yelling. Defendant slipped in a puddle of blood as he jumped over Juan to reach  
12 Juanita. He thereafter grabbed Juanita and told Joey that he should "shut up" his  
13 mother. Joey then stabbed his mother repeatedly and pushed her into the sewing  
14 room, where she was found. Defendant did not tell Hernandez that he did  
15 anything other than hold Juanita; instead defendant claimed that he saw Joey stab  
16 both victims with a kitchen knife. Defendant ended his story with the comment  
17 that after the murders he threw the bar into the front yard, and that the knife was  
18 thrown into a canal. Defendant noted that Joey took the television, a toolbox, and  
19 his parents' hatchback automobile. Hernandez thereafter reported defendant's  
20 statements to police investigator Stratton.

21 *b. Statements Made to Police Investigator Stratton*

22 On February 19, 1987, Stratton met with defendant in the Kern County jail.  
23 Defendant had contacted the police through his attorney because he wished to  
24 offer statements about the Bocanegra crimes. Before commencing the interview,  
25 defendant waived his right to counsel after receiving the admonitions required by  
26 Miranda v. Arizona (1966) 384 U.S. 436 [16 L.Ed.2d 694, 86 S. Ct. 1602, 10  
A.L.R.3d 974]. Thereafter, he told Stratton that about 10 a.m., on the day of the  
Bocanegra murders, he met Joey Bocanegra on the street and spoke to him for a  
few minutes before Joey walked home. Defendant then walked by the Bocanegra  
house and observed Joey leaving the home. At that point, the interview with  
Stratton ended.

27 One week later, Stratton again spoke to defendant. At this point, defendant asked  
28 Stratton a series of hypothetical questions, including: "What if I was present in the  
house; what if Joey hit his dad after his dad had refused to give him some money;  
and what if Joey's dad hit him back and what if Joey got real mad and grabbed a  
knife and started stabbing his dad; what if Joey's mother didn't know what was  
happening because she was in another room?"

21 *c. Statements Made to Homicide Detective Boggs*

22 On March 27, 1987, after waiving his *Miranda* rights, defendant was interviewed  
23 about the Tatman murder by Homicide Detective Boggs. Defendant had already  
24 been arrested for the Bocanegra murders and agreed to talk to the officer because  
he believed he could be spending the rest of his life in prison.

25 Boggs testified that defendant told him he wanted to rob Tatman of his  
26 refrigerator because he needed one. Defendant told Boggs that, because he was so  
intoxicated (from ingesting alcohol and drugs) at the time of the robbery, he could  
not remember the sequence of events.

27 According to Boggs, defendant asked Reyes to pry open Tatman's bathroom  
28 window with Reyes's screwdriver. Once inside, Reyes removed the contents of

1 Tatman's refrigerator, and defendant moved it to a room next door that had been  
2 rented by Vicky Ornalez, a friend of the perpetrators.

3 Defendant told Boggs that when he returned to Tatman's room, Tatman was  
4 awake and Reyes was standing over him with a screwdriver in his hand.  
5 Defendant claimed he had no idea why Reyes was acting this way because both  
6 men had discussed trying not to awaken Tatman while they removed his property.  
7 Reyes then hit Tatman in the chest, pulled Tatman off the bed and onto the floor,  
8 and made multiple lunging movements downward with the screwdriver in his  
9 hand. Defendant asserted that the bed partially blocked his view, but he  
10 nonetheless believed Reyes was stabbing Tatman. After Reyes completed the  
11 murder, both defendant and Reyes returned to Vickie Ornalez's room.

12 *d. Defendant's Post-Arrest Comments to Michael Trihey*

13 Michael Trihey was a reporter for the Bakersfield Californian. Prior to trial, he  
14 interviewed defendant five times about the charges pending against him. On April  
15 25, 1988, the paper published a Trihey article entitled, *Accused Asks for Own  
16 Death, System Says No*. According to Trihey, defendant told him that he was a  
17 "triple murderer" and that the Bocanegras and Tatman were killed for their Social  
18 Security checks.

19 **B. Penalty Phase Evidence**

20 The prosecution introduced evidence of defendant's criminal activity involving  
21 the use or attempted use of force or violence. (§ 190.3, factor (b).) On May 7,  
22 1982, defendant assaulted store owner Hassan Ahmad Ammarie after defendant  
23 asked Ammarie to "get him some bacon" and Ammarie refused. Defendant  
24 stabbed Ammarie in the left shoulder and neck. Ammarie was hospitalized for  
25 two weeks following the attack.

26 On June 2, 1982, defendant attacked an acquaintance, Arthur Melendez Pena,  
27 after Pena refused to comply with defendant's demand for money.

28 Several witnesses who had testified at the preliminary hearing also testified at the  
29 penalty phase. Homicide Detective Boggs testified defendant had told him that  
30 after removing Tatman's possessions to Ornalez's room, he and Reyes "kicked  
31 back, drank some whiskey, smoked some dope, ate some food and just relaxed for  
32 the rest of the evening." Informant Rufus Hernandez and Police Detective Stratton  
33 also testified that defendant told Hernandez that he took an active role in the  
34 Bocanegra and Tatman slayings-including beating Juan and Juanita Bocanegra,  
35 and beating and assisting Reyes in stabbing Tatman. Stratton repeated  
36 Hernandez's statements to him that defendant and Joey Bocanegra went to Juan  
37 and Juanita's house and planned to rob them and that Tatman was robbed for his  
38 Social Security check. Rose McGrew, the Bakersfield Inn maid, repeated her guilt  
39 phase testimony about how she discovered Tatman's body.

40 With regard to the Bocanegra murders, Hernandez testified that defendant entered  
41 the house with a bar and "ran up to Joey's father and grabbed him and held him  
42 there until Joey went and got the knife and they just beat him and stabbed him."  
43 When Juanita walked out of her sewing room, defendant "rushed" her: "That's  
44 when they both started killing her.... They just stabbed her numerous times and hit  
45 her in the head a few times with the bar, and the time, at the same time of doing  
46 that I guess Joey somehow managed to get her back inside the room, I guess,  
47 while he was hitting her...." The prosecution also introduced six color  
48 photographs of the victims and forty-eight other color photographs of the

1 Bocanegra and Batman crime scenes. Criminalist Greg Laskowski testified that  
2 the blood splatter in the hallway of the Bocanegra house was consistent with the  
3 prosecution's theory that multiple stabbings occurred there.  
4

5 Defendant's penalty phase evidence consisted of testimony by friends, relatives,  
6 and a social anthropologist to the effect that defendant's dysfunctional and  
7 poverty-stricken, migratory family life severely hampered his ability to live a  
8 productive life. Defendant was rejected by his mother following his birth and was  
9 sent to live with his grandparents. When he was three years old, defendant's  
10 mother and stepfather unexpectedly wrenched defendant from his grandparents'  
11 home to move to Arkansas. Shortly thereafter, defendant's mother left defendant's  
12 stepfather, and took defendant and his half-brother to California. Defendant's  
13 mother remarried a man with three children, and the couple thereafter had five  
14 additional children.

15 Defendant's mother and his stepfather were alcoholics and drug abusers who were  
16 violent with each other and the children. His grandparents, who were often in  
17 charge of defendant, also drank heavily and abused drugs. Both defendant's  
18 mother and stepfather died in their middle 30's of acute alcoholism. Defendant  
19 tried to take care of his siblings, but took drugs to escape his difficult life. He  
20 eventually turned to crime because he had no marketable job skills to prepare him  
21 for life as an adult.

22 Penalty phase defense counsel Gary Frank attempted to persuade the jury that  
23 defendant should receive a sentence of life without the possibility of parole and  
24 "spend the remainder of his life in prison."

25 Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th 1, 17-23 (1995).

### 16 III.

#### 17 JURISDICTION

18 Relief by way of a petition for writ of habeas corpus extends to a person in custody  
19 pursuant to the judgment of a state court if the custody is in violation of the Constitution or laws  
20 or treaties of the United States. 28 U.S.C. § 2254(a); 28 U.S.C. § 2241(c)(3); Williams v.  
21 Taylor, 529 U.S. 362, 375 (2000). Petitioner asserts that he suffered violations of his rights as  
22 guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution. The challenged conviction arises out of Kern County  
23 Superior Court, which is located within the jurisdiction of this Court. 28 U.S.C. § 2254(a); 28  
24 U.S.C. § 2241(d).

25 This action was initiated on November 20, 1997. Because this action was initiated after  
26 April 24, 1996, the amendments to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 enacted as part of the Antiterrorism and  
27 Effective Death Penalty Act (AEDPA) apply. See Lindh v. Murphy, 521 U.S. 320, 336 (1997);  
28 Van Tran v. Lindsey, 212 F.3d 1143, 1148 (9th Cir. 2000), overruled on other grounds by

1 Lockyer v. Andrade, 538 U.S. 63, 71 (2003).

2 **IV.**

3 **STANDARDS OF REVIEW**

4 **A. Legal Standard - Habeas Corpus**

5 Under the AEDPA, relitigation of any claim adjudicated on the merits in state court is  
6 barred unless a petitioner can show that the state court's adjudication of his claim:

7 (1) resulted in a decision that was contrary to, or involved an unreasonable  
8 application of, clearly established Federal law, as determined by the Supreme  
9 Court of the United States; or

10 (2) resulted in a decision that was based on an unreasonable determination of the  
11 facts in light of the evidence presented in the State court proceeding.

12 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d); Harrington v. Richter, 562 U.S. 86, 98 (2011); Lockyer, 538 U.S. at 70-71;  
13 Williams, 529 U.S. at 413.

14 As a threshold matter, this Court must “first decide what constitutes ‘clearly established  
15 Federal law, as determined by the Supreme Court of the United States.’” Lockyer, 538 U.S. at  
16 71 (quoting 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d)(1)). In ascertaining what is “clearly established Federal law,”  
17 this Court must look to the “holdings, as opposed to the dicta, of [the Supreme Court's] decisions  
18 as of the time of the relevant state-court decision.” Williams, 529 U.S. at 412. “In other words,  
19 ‘clearly established Federal law’ under § 2254(d)(1) is the governing legal principle or principles  
20 set forth by the Supreme Court at the time the state court renders its decision.” Id. In addition,  
21 the Supreme Court decision must “‘squarely address [] the issue in th[e] case’; otherwise, there is  
22 no clearly established Federal law for purposes of review under AEDPA.” Moses v. Payne, 555  
23 F.3d 742, 754 (9th Cir. 2009) (quoting Wright v. Van Patten, 552 U.S. 120, 125 (2008)); see also  
24 Panetti v. Quarterman, 551 U.S. 930, 949 (2007); Carey v. Musladin, 549 U.S. 70, 74 (2006). If  
25 no clearly established Federal law exists, the inquiry is at an end and the Court must defer to the  
26 state court's decision. Carey, 549 U.S. 70; Wright, 552 U.S. at 126; Moses, 555 F.3d at 760. In  
27 addition, the Supreme Court has recently clarified that habeas relief is unavailable in instances  
28 where a state court arguably refuses to extend a governing legal principle to a context in which

1 the principle should have controlled. White v. Woodall, --- U.S. ---, 134 S. Ct. 1697, 1706  
2 (2014). The Supreme Court stated: “[I]f a habeas court must extend a rationale before it can  
3 apply to the facts at hand,’ then by definition the rationale was not ‘clearly established at the time  
4 of the state-court decision.” Id. (quoting Yarborough v. Alvarado, 541 U.S. 652, 666 (2004)).

5 If the Court determines there is governing clearly established Federal law, the Court must  
6 then consider whether the state court's decision was “contrary to, or involved an unreasonable  
7 application of,” [the] clearly established Federal law.” Lockyer, 538 U.S. at 72 (quoting 28  
8 U.S.C. § 2254(d)(1)). “Under the ‘contrary to’ clause, a federal habeas court may grant the writ  
9 if the state court arrives at a conclusion opposite to that reached by [the Supreme] Court on a  
10 question of law or if the state court decides a case differently than [the] Court has on a set of  
11 materially indistinguishable facts.” Williams, 529 U.S. at 412-13; see also Lockyer, 538 U.S. at  
12 72. “The word ‘contrary’ is commonly understood to mean ‘diametrically different,’ ‘opposite  
13 in character or nature,’ or ‘mutually opposed.’” Williams, 529 U.S. at 405 (quoting Webster's  
14 Third New International Dictionary 495 (1976)). “A state-court decision will certainly be  
15 contrary to [Supreme Court] clearly established precedent if the state court applies a rule that  
16 contradicts the governing law set forth in [Supreme Court] cases.” Id.

17 “Under the ‘reasonable application clause,’ a federal habeas court may grant the writ if  
18 the state court identifies the correct governing legal principle from [the] Court's decisions but  
19 unreasonably applies that principle to the facts of the prisoner's case.” Williams, 529 U.S. at  
20 413. “[A] federal court may not issue the writ simply because the court concludes in its  
21 independent judgment that the relevant state court decision applied clearly established federal  
22 law erroneously or incorrectly. Rather, that application must also be unreasonable.” Id. at 411;  
23 see also Lockyer, 538 U.S. at 75-76. “A state court's determination that a claim lacks merit  
24 precludes federal habeas relief so long as fair-minded jurists could disagree on the correctness of  
25 the state court's decision.” Richter, 562 U.S. at 101, citing Yarborough, 541 U.S. at 664. The  
26 Supreme Court stated:

27  
28 As a condition for obtaining habeas corpus from a federal court, a state prisoner

1 must show that the state court's ruling on the claim being presented in federal  
2 court was so lacking in justification that there was an error well understood and  
3 comprehended in existing law beyond any possibility for fair-minded  
4 disagreement.

5 Id. at 103. In other words, so long as fair-minded jurists could disagree on the correctness of the  
6 state courts decision, the decision cannot be considered unreasonable. Id. at 101. In applying  
7 this standard, “a habeas court must determine what arguments or theories supported . . . or could  
8 have supported the state court’s decision; and then it must ask whether it is possible fair-minded  
9 jurists could disagree that those arguments or theories are inconsistent with the holding in a prior  
10 decision of [the Supreme Court].” Id. at 102. This objective standard of reasonableness applies  
11 to review under both subsections of 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d). See Hibbler v. Benedetti, 693 F.3d  
12 1140, 1146-47 (9th Cir. 2012). If the Court determines that the state court decision is objectively  
13 unreasonable, and the error is not structural, habeas relief is nonetheless unavailable unless the  
14 error had a substantial and injurious effect on the verdict. Brecht v. Abrahamson, 507 U.S. 619,  
637 (1993).

15 Petitioner has the burden of establishing that the decision of the state court is contrary to  
16 or involved an unreasonable application of United States Supreme Court precedent. Baylor v.  
17 Estelle, 94 F.3d 1321, 1325 (9th Cir. 1996). Although only Supreme Court law is binding on the  
18 states, Ninth Circuit precedent remains relevant persuasive authority in determining whether a  
19 state court decision is objectively unreasonable. See LaJoie v. Thompson, 217 F.3d 663, 669 n.6  
20 (9th Cir. 2000); Duhaime v. Ducharme, 200 F.3d 597, 600-01 (9th Cir. 1999).

21 The AEDPA requires considerable deference to the state courts. “[R]eview under §  
22 2254(d)(1) is limited to the record that was before the state court that adjudicated the claim on  
23 the merits,” and “evidence introduced in federal court has no bearing on 2254(d)(1) review.”  
24 Cullen v. Pinholster, \_\_ U.S. \_\_, \_\_, 131 S. Ct. 1388, 1398-99 (2011). “Factual determinations  
25 by state courts are presumed correct absent clear and convincing evidence to the contrary.”  
26 Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 340 (2003) (citing 28 U.S.C. § 2254(e)(1)). However, a  
27 state court factual finding is not entitled to deference if the relevant state court record is  
28

1 unavailable for the federal court to review. Townsend v. Sain, 372 U.S. 293, 319 (1963),  
2 overruled by Keeney v. Tamayo-Reyes, 504 U.S. 1 (1992).

3 If a petitioner satisfies either subsection (1) or (2) for a claim, then the federal court  
4 considers that claim de novo. See Panetti, 551 U.S. at 953 (when section 2254(d) is satisfied,  
5 “[a] federal court must then resolve the claim without the deference AEDPA otherwise  
6 requires.”); Frantz v. Hazey, 533 F.3d 724, 737 (9th Cir. 2008).

7 In this case, many of Petitioner’s claims were raised and rejected by the California  
8 Supreme Court on direct appeal. However, many of his claims were raised in his state habeas  
9 petition to the California Supreme Court, and summarily denied on the merits. In such a case  
10 where the state court decision is unaccompanied by an explanation, “the habeas petitioner’s  
11 burden still must be met by showing there was no reasonable basis for the state court to deny  
12 relief.” Richter, 562 U.S. at 98. The Supreme Court stated that “a habeas court must determine  
13 what arguments or theories supported or . . . *could have supported*, the state court’s decision; and  
14 then it must ask whether it is possible fair-minded jurists could disagree that those arguments or  
15 theories are inconsistent with the holding in a prior decision of this Court.” Id. at 786 (emphasis  
16 added). Petitioner bears “the burden to demonstrate that ‘there was no reasonable basis for the  
17 state court to deny relief.’” Walker v. Martel, 709 F.3d 925, 939 (9th Cir. 2013) (quoting  
18 Richter, 562 U.S. at 98). “Crucially, this is not a de novo review of the constitutional question,”  
19 id., as “even a strong case for relief does not mean the state court’s contrary conclusion was  
20 unreasonable,” Id. (quoting Richter, 562 U.S. at 102); (see also Murray v. Schriro, 745 F.3d 984,  
21 996-97, (9th Cir. 2014)).

22 When reviewing the California Supreme Court’s summary denial of a petition, this Court  
23 must consider that the California Supreme Court’s summary denial of a habeas petition on the  
24 merits reflects that court’s determination that:

25  
26 [T]he claims made in th[e] petition do not state a prima facie case entitling the  
27 petitioner to relief. It appears that the court generally assumes the allegations in  
the petition to be true, but does not accept wholly conclusory allegations, and will  
also review the record of the trial ... to assess the merits of the petitioner’s claims.

1 Pinholster, 131 S. Ct. at 402 n.12 (quoting In re Clark, 5 Cal. 4th 750, 770 (1993) (citing People  
2 v. Duvall, 9 Cal. 4th 464, 474 (1995)). Accordingly, if this Court finds Petitioner has unarguably  
3 presented a prima facie case for relief on a claim, the state court's summary rejection of that  
4 claim would be unreasonable. Taylor v. Maddox, 366 F.3d 992, 1000 (9th Cir. 2004); Nunes v.  
5 Mueller, 350 F.3d 1045, 1054-55 (9th Cir. 2003).

6 For any habeas claim that has not been adjudicated on the merits by the state court, the  
7 federal court reviews the claim de novo without the deference usually accorded state courts  
8 under 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d)(1). Chaker v. Crogan, 428 F.3d 1215, 1221 (9th Cir. 2005); Pirtle v.  
9 Morgan, 313 F.3d 1160, 1167 (9th Cir. 2002). In such instances, however, the provisions of 28  
10 U.S.C. § 2254(e) still apply. Pinholster, 131 S. Ct. at 1401 (“Section 2254(e)(2) continues to  
11 have force where § 2254(d)(1) does not bar federal habeas relief.”); Pirtle, 313 F.3d at 1167-68  
12 (stating that state court findings of fact are presumed correct under § 2254(e)(1) even if legal  
13 review is de novo).

14 **V.**

15 **PROCEDURAL BARS**

16 All of Petitioner's claims have been raised to the California Supreme Court and denied on  
17 the merits. In addition, some of his claims were denied as procedurally barred. As to those  
18 claims, Respondent has argued that California's timeliness rule for state habeas petitions,  
19 California's rule barring claims on state habeas that could have been presented on direct appeal,  
20 and California's contemporaneous objection rule are all adequate and independent state grounds  
21 that bar federal habeas review. The Court will not address procedural default with this order  
22 because all of the claims lack merit, and the Court finds the question of procedural default to be  
23 relatively complicated in this case. See Franklin v. Johnson, 290 F.3d 1223, 1232 (9th Cir. 2002)  
24 (Courts may reach the merits of a case prior to addressing procedural default); Bell v. Cone, 543  
25 U.S. 447, 451 n.3 (2005); Loggins v. Thomas, 654 F.3d 1204, 1215 (11th Cir. 2011).

26 **VI.**

27 **REVIEW OF CLAIMS**

1           **A.     Claims Relating to Conviction and Sentence**

2           1.     Sufficiency of the Evidence - Claims 1<sup>3</sup> and 3<sup>4</sup>

3           In claims 1 and 3, Petitioner states that he was convicted and sentenced for the first  
4 degree murders of Mr. Bocanegra and Mrs. Bocanegra on insufficient evidence that he acted  
5 with deliberation and premeditation, see People v. Anderson, 70 Cal.2d 15, 26-27 (1968),  
6 depriving him of due process under the Fourteenth Amendment.

7           a.     **Clearly Established Law**

8           A federal habeas court reviews challenges to the sufficiency of the evidence by  
9 determining whether in “viewing the evidence in a light most favorable to the prosecution, any  
10 rational trier of fact could have found the essential elements of the crime beyond a reasonable  
11 doubt.” Lewis v. Jeffers, 497 U.S. 764, 781 (1990). “A reviewing court must consider all of the  
12 evidence admitted by the trial court, regardless whether that evidence was admitted erroneously.”  
13 McDaniel v. Brown, 558 U.S. 120, 131 (2010). Sufficiency of the evidence claims raised in §  
14 2254 proceedings must be measured with reference to substantive requirements as defined by  
15 state law. Jackson v. Virginia, 443 U.S. 307, 324 n.16 (1979). In cases where the evidence is  
16 unclear or would support conflicting inferences, the federal court “must presume -- even if it  
17 does not affirmatively appear in the record -- that the trier of fact resolved any such conflict in  
18 favor of the prosecution, and must defer to that resolution.” Id. at 326. To prevail here,  
19 Petitioner must show “that the prosecution’s case against him “was so lacking that the trial court  
20 should have entered a judgment of acquittal.” McDaniel, 558 U.S. at 131.

21           The AEDPA adds another layer of deference over the already deferential Jackson  
22 standard. Under the AEDPA, the federal court may not grant a habeas petition unless it finds that  
23 the state court unreasonably applied the principles underlying the Jackson standard when  
24 reviewing the petitioner’s claim. See e.g., Juan H. v. Allen, 408 F.3d 1262, 1275 n.12 (9th Cir.  
25 2005); Jones v. Wood, 114 F.3d 1002, 1013 (9th Cir. 1997) (en banc) (recognizing that  
26 “unreasonable application” standard applies to insufficient evidence claim). “Expressed more

27           <sup>3</sup> The legal bases of the Fifth, Sixth and Eighth Amendments were stricken as unexhausted. ECF No. 60 at 8:25-26.

28           <sup>4</sup> The legal bases of the Fifth, Sixth and Eighth Amendments were stricken as unexhausted. ECF No. 60 at 9:1-3.

1 fully, this means a reviewing court faced with a record of historical facts that supports conflicting  
2 inferences must presume -- even if it does not affirmatively appear in the record -- that the trier  
3 of fact resolved any such conflicts in favor of the prosecution, and must defer to that resolution.”  
4 McDaniel, 558 U.S. at 133.

5 Evidence is sufficient under the due process clause where “after viewing the evidence in  
6 the light most favorable to the prosecution, any rational trier of fact could have found the  
7 essential elements of the crime beyond a reasonable doubt.” Jackson, 443 U.S. at 319; see also  
8 Payne v. Borg, 982 F.2d 335, 338 (9th Cir. 1992).

9 **b. Review of Claims 1 and 3**

10 The state supreme court, on direct appeal, considered claimed insufficiency of the  
11 evidence and rejected Petitioner’s claim of “wading into [the] fight” and being ineffectual in the  
12 assaults; finding instead that the evidence clearly reflects that defendant aided and abetted Joey  
13 in killing both Mr. Bocanegra and Mrs. Bocanegra, as follows:

14 [S]ubstantial evidence supports the trial court’s finding that Joey Bocanegra  
15 intended to kill his parents, that he premeditated and deliberated the murders, and  
16 that defendant can be found vicariously liable for the murders as an aider and  
17 abettor. As we have observed, an aider and abettor must act with knowledge of  
18 the criminal purpose of the perpetrator and with an intent either of committing, or  
19 of encouraging or facilitating commission of, the offense. [Citation] We have also  
20 recognized that if the aider and abettor undertakes acts “with the intent that the  
21 actual perpetrator’s purpose be facilitated thereby, he is a principal and liable for  
22 the commission of the offense.” [Citation] Thus, the basis of liability for the  
23 perpetrator applies to the aider and abettor and extends to “the natural and  
24 reasonable consequences of the acts he knowingly and intelligently aids and  
25 encourages.” [Citation] As we explain, we conclude that defendant shared Joey’s  
26 intent to kill, and in assisting Joey in committing the crimes, understood, and  
27 facilitated, the full extent of Joey’s criminal purpose.

28 Hernandez testified, and defendant admitted to Detective Stratton, that defendant initially waited outside while Joey entered his parents’ house. Defendant then entered the house after hearing the sounds of a fight between Joey and Juan. Defendant told Hernandez that he went inside the house to break up the fight between Joey and his father, but the facts belie his stated intent. When defendant entered the house, he saw Joey fighting with his father. Rather than come to Juan’s aid, defendant grabbed a curved metal bar and commenced beating Juan.

Joey’s actions, according to defendant’s statements to prosecution witnesses, indicated that Joey deliberated over his father’s killing. Joey initially struck Juan in the hallway and then, in the kitchen, obtained a knife that he used to stab Juan. In our view, Joey formed a clear intent to kill, at the latest, during the altercation with his father, and obtained a kitchen knife to carry out that plan. Our cases hold

1 that planning activity occurring over a short period of time is sufficient to find  
2 premeditation. ““The true test is not the duration of time as much as it is the extent  
3 of the reflection. Thoughts may follow each other with great rapidity and cold,  
4 calculated judgment may be arrived at quickly ....”” [Citation]

5 There was also ample evidence of motive. The evidence supports a strong  
6 inference that Joey entered his parents' house to rob them. When his father  
7 resisted the robbery, Joey was motivated to murder him in order to gain access to  
8 both money and tangible goods, including a television set. Substantial evidence  
9 supports a finding that Joey believed Juan stood in the way of his plan.

10 Finally, the trial court could infer from the evidence that the manner of killing  
11 tended to demonstrate Joey acted with premeditation and deliberation. The attack  
12 occurred in a series of rooms, indicating that Juan's repeated attempts to break  
13 away from his murderers were consistently thwarted by the attackers' relentless  
14 pursuit of him, even after he was gravely wounded. A rational finder of fact could  
15 infer that the manner of killing, when combined with Joey's retrieval of the knife  
16 in the kitchen, and defendant's retrieval of a metal bar used in clubbing a  
17 defenseless Juan, is sufficient to support the trier of fact's implied finding that  
18 Joey formed the plan to kill his parents during the altercation, located the murder  
19 weapon, and along with defendant, deliberately murdered his father. [Citation]

20 The same evidence supports the trial court's finding that defendant shared Joey's  
21 intent and plan to kill Juan, and thus was liable, as an aider and abettor, for Juan's  
22 murder. [Citation] The killing of Juan ended after a prolonged knife attack and  
23 beating from which Juan attempted to defend himself. Defendant's personal  
24 involvement in the murder was substantial. Far from merely acting as a lookout,  
25 or beating Juan after he was already dead, defendant was actively involved in  
26 assisting Joey in Juan's murder. Defendant's admitted act of arming himself with a  
27 curved metal bar before joining the altercation between Joey and Juan indicates he  
28 shared Joey's plan. [Citation] From this evidence, the trier of fact could  
reasonably infer defendant knowingly engaged or assisted in Juan's murder as an  
aider and abettor. [Citation]

As to Juanita's murder, defendant asserts the evidence similarly does not support  
the conviction. He claims that he ““did not personally kill Juanita [because] she  
was stabbed to death by Joey.”” He asserts that there is ““no evidence in the record  
that [he] held Juanita down, helped push her back to the sewing room, or had any  
contact with her while Joey was stabbing her.”” He contends that there is no  
evidence to support the People's theory that defendant aided Joey by hitting  
Juanita with a bar and that “[t]here is simply no evidence that [his] initial  
grabbing of Juanita actually aided, or even was intended to aid, Joey's subsequent  
stabbing of his mother.”” Finally, defendant asserts in his reply brief that his  
““efforts to tie and gag Juanita are altogether inconsistent with an intent to kill  
her.””

Again, the evidence supports the court's verdicts and refutes defendant's  
contention. Hernandez testified defendant told him that during the murder of Juan,  
Juanita screamed. Defendant grabbed Juanita and told Joey to ““shut her up.”” Joey  
then stabbed his mother 26 times. A bloodstained garment was wrapped around  
Juanita's neck, and her wrists had been tied together with a piece of fabric. The  
pathologist (Holloway) opined that Juanita died of the stab wounds and that the  
ligature constriction of her neck was a possible contributing cause. She also had  
severe scalp injuries that Holloway concluded were consistent with those inflicted

1 by a long bar or pipe less than one-half inch in diameter, similar to the instrument  
2 used by defendant to inflict Juan's scalp wounds. The trial court could reasonably  
3 infer from the evidence that Juanita was killed in order to keep her from being a  
4 percipient witness to the murder of her husband. Thus, viewing the evidence in  
5 the light most favorable to the People, we conclude a "rational trier of fact" could  
6 have been persuaded "that the killing was the result of preexisting reflection and  
7 weighing of considerations rather than mere unconsidered or rash impulse."  
8 [Citation] Defendant's participation in Juanita's murder, like his aiding and  
9 abetting in Juan's killing, clearly supports a finding that defendant aided and  
10 abetted her murder. [Citation]

11 Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 33-36.

12  
13 Under California law, "[m]urder is the unlawful killing of a human being . . . with malice  
14 aforethought." Cal. Pen. Code § 187, subd. (a). "[A]ll murder which is perpetrated . . . by any  
15 kind of willful, deliberate, and premeditated killing . . . is murder of the first degree . . ." Cal.  
16 Pen. Code § 189; see People v. Berryman, 6 Cal.4th 1048, 1085 (1993) (overruled on other  
17 grounds, People v. Hill, 17 Cal.4th 800, 822-23 (1998)). Premeditation and deliberation are  
18 generally established by proof of (1) planning activity; (2) motive (established by a prior  
19 relationship and/or conduct with the victim); and (3) manner of killing. People v. Anderson, 70  
20 Cal.2d 15, 26-27 (1968). The California Supreme Court "sustains verdicts of first degree murder  
21 typically when there is evidence of all three types and otherwise requires at least extremely  
22 strong evidence of (1) or evidence of (2) in conjunction with either (1) or (3)." Id., at 27.

23 A person "aids and abets the commission of a crime when he or she, acting with (1)  
24 knowledge of the unlawful purpose of the perpetrator; and (2) the intent or purpose of  
25 committing, encouraging, or facilitating the commission of the offense, (3) by act or advice aids,  
26 promotes, encourages or instigates, the commission of the crime." People v. Beeman, 35 Cal.3d  
27 547, 561 (1984).

28 The state court could reasonably have concluded that the fight with Mr. Bocanegra  
1 resulted from pursuit of the joint motive of Joey and Petitioner to obtain money from Mr.  
2 Bocanegra, the stated reason for their going to the Bocanegra home. (See Clerk's Transcript on  
3 Appeal, hereinafter "CT", 502-504.) After the murders, in furtherance of this motive, Petitioner  
4 assisted Joey in removing property from the Bocanegra home (CT 484.) Some of this property

1 was later found in Petitioner's room, or sold by him. (Reporter's Transcript on Appeal,  
2 hereinafter "RT", 25-29, 35-37, 67-69.)

3 Petitioner disclaims premeditation and deliberation in the murders, claiming Joey, and by  
4 extension Petitioner, acted rashly and on impulse. But the extended nature and duration of the  
5 struggles with Mr. Bocanegra and Mrs. Bocanegra, with Joey taking time to get a kitchen knife  
6 (CT 504; RT 2854), and Petitioner attempting to subdue and restrain each of the victims during  
7 Joey's assault on them, seeing Joey stab them, along with the multiple stab and blunt force  
8 wounds inflicted during room to room struggle with the victims, could reasonably suggest a plan  
9 to kill them. (CT112-120; 149-153; 181; 192-194; 357-383; 479-483; 488.) Each victim suffered  
10 multiple stab wounds, Mrs. Bocanegra was stabbed at least 26 times and had 6 scalp wounds and  
11 Mr. Bocanegra was stabbed at least eight times and had nine scalp wounds. (Id.) Both victims  
12 were left unassisted to bleed to death. (CT 112-114, 117-119.) There was evidence Mrs.  
13 Bocanegra's wrists had been tied together and that she had been gagged. (CT 113, 149-150,  
14 153.) Jailhouse informant Hernandez consistently testified Petitioner told him that when  
15 fighting broke out between Joey and Mr. Bocanegra (CT 479-505), in the hallway (id.; RT 2843,  
16 2852-2853), Petitioner responded by hitting Mr. Bocanegra on the head nine times with a curved  
17 bar (CT 479-505; CT 112-114; 117-119), that when Mrs. Bocanegra came out of a back bedroom  
18 and started yelling Petitioner grabbed her and told Joey to "shut her up." (CT 483, 488, 504.)  
19 Petitioner's claim that it was Joey who stabbed his parents to death (CT 488; RT 121-122), does  
20 not undermine evidence above that Petitioner aided and abetted Joey to that end.

21 The physical evidence is consistent with Hernandez's testimony. The evidentiary record  
22 reasonably suggests that Mr. Bocanegra was initially assaulted in the hallway and then murdered  
23 in the kitchen (CT 355-381). The coroner, Dr. Holloway, opined Mr. Bocanegra died from  
24 multiple stab wounds and that other conditions were the multiple blunt force trauma wounds to  
25 Mr. Bocanegra's head (CT 117-119); that Mrs. Bocanegra died from multiple stab wounds and  
26 had six wounds to her scalp (CT 112-115; 153-154); that the scalp wounds were caused by an  
27 instrument different from that used to inflict the stab wounds; and that ligature construction was  
28

1 a possible contributing cause. (CT 112-119.)

2 Both at the preliminary hearing and the penalty phase, Hernandez testified that Petitioner  
3 struck Mr. Bocanegra with a bar (CT 479-482, 500-501, RT 2843-2844, 2854), and that he  
4 grabbed or “rushed” Mrs. Bocanegra, a witness to Mr. Bocanegra’s murder (id.; RT 153, 189)  
5 and told Joey to “shut her up” (CT 483, 504; RT 2844). Hernandez testimony that the altercation  
6 between Mr. Bocanegra and Joey started in the hallway and moved to the kitchen is consistent  
7 with the bloodstain pattern evidence, (CT 355-383; 479, 487-488, 500-501; RT 2843-2845) and  
8 other crime scene evidence. (Id.) Petitioner’s claim that a third person, Robert Reyes (“Reyes”),  
9 was in the house during the murders and may have aided Joey in the murders, is not substantially  
10 supported by the evidentiary record. (Id.; CT 131-133)

11 Petitioner attempts to discount testimony that he intended to rob the Bocanegras prior to  
12 their murder. Petitioner correctly notes that the trial court did not find him guilty of robbing the  
13 Bocanegras and found the robbery-murder special circumstance untrue on grounds Petitioner’s  
14 intent to rob arose after the murders. (CT 906; RT 235-237.) Even so, Petitioner has not  
15 controverted evidence that he used a metal bar during the murders. (CT 479-482, 500-501, RT  
16 2843-2844, 2854RT 236). The trial court rejected Hernandez testimony, favorable to Petitioner,  
17 that Petitioner merely grabbed Mrs. Bocanegra. (CT 483.)

18 No facts or discrepancies between the testimony and the physical evidence establish or  
19 compel the conclusion that Hernandez, by virtue of his alleged substance addiction, his plea deal,  
20 or otherwise, was motivated to and did testify falsely or inaccurately. For reasons discussed in  
21 claim 7, the state court could reasonably have found Hernandez received no undisclosed sentence  
22 concession in return for his testimony. (State Habeas Corpus Petition, hereinafter “SHCP”, Ex.  
23 900, pp. 4, 11; State Court Response to Petition, hereinafter “SResp.”, Ex. B.)

24 The state court could reasonably conclude that Petitioner, sharing Joey’s motive of  
25 obtaining money from Mr. Bocanegra, took Joey’s side in the struggles with Mr. Bocanegra and  
26 Mrs. Bocanegra, verbally assisting and encouraging him and physically restraining and  
27 assaulting both victims. Petitioner’s statements to Hernandez, Detective Stratton and reporter

1 Trihey, and the physical evidence in the Bocanegra home are evidence of his guilt. Any  
2 inconsistencies in Hernandez's preliminary hearing testimony and his penalty phase testimony  
3 are not substantially material or probative of and do not preclude the possibility of his guilt and  
4 sentence to death.

5 Moreover, Petitioner inculpated himself in the murders. He asked Bakersfield detective  
6 Stratton "what if [he] was present at the Bocanegra home during the murders." (CT 77-78). He  
7 told newspaper reporter Trihey he was a "triple murderer." (RT 16-18.)

8 A rational trier of fact could have found the essential elements of the crime beyond a  
9 reasonable doubt based on the evidence in the record. The state court's denial of these claims  
10 was not contrary to, or an unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law, or based  
11 on an unreasonable determination of the facts in light of the evidence presented in the state court  
12 proceeding. 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d); Jackson, 443 U.S. at 319.

13 Claims 1 and 3 are denied.<sup>5</sup>

14 2. Actual Innocence - Claims 2 and 4

15 In claims 2 and 4, Petitioner claims actual innocence of the first degree murders of Mr.  
16 Bocanegra and Mrs. Bocanegra based on evidence existing before trial and later discovered  
17 evidence, such that his conviction and sentence represent a fundamental miscarriage of justice  
18 violating the Fifth, Sixth, Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments.

19 a. **Clearly Established Law**

20 i. Actual Innocence

21 The showing required for a free standing claim of actual innocence, i.e., a claim  
22 irrespective of constitutional error at trial or sentencing, is "extraordinarily high" and must be  
23 "truly persuasive." Herrera v. Collins, 506 U.S. 390, 417, (1993). To carry this burden  
24 Petitioner must affirmatively prove he is innocent. See Carriger v. Stewart, 132 F.3d 463, 476-  
25 77 (9th Cir. 1997).

26 <sup>5</sup> Reyes pled guilty to first degree murder in the three homicides and to the robberies of Tatman and the Bocanegras  
27 and was sentenced to three consecutive terms of 25 years to life. People v. Robert Gabriel Reyes, Kern County  
Superior Court Case No. 34638. Charges against Joey Bocanegra were dismissed for insufficient evidence. People  
v. Jose Juan Bocanegra, Kern County Superior Court Case No. 34638.

1       In Schlup v. Delo, 513 U.S. 298 (1995) the Supreme Court reached actual innocence as a  
2 gateway claim to consideration of otherwise barred Constitutional claims. “If a habeas petitioner  
3 . . . presents evidence of innocence so strong that a court cannot have confidence in the outcome  
4 of the trial unless the court is also satisfied that the trial was free of non-harmless constitutional  
5 error, the petitioner should be allowed to pass through the gateway and argue the merits of his  
6 underlying claims.” Schlup at 316. The Schlup court held that the proper standard is that a  
7 procedurally defaulted petitioner must show that a constitutional violation has *probably* resulted  
8 in the conviction of one who is actually innocent. Schlup at 326.

9       “The petitioner must show that it is more likely than not that no reasonable juror would  
10 have convicted him in the light of the new evidence.” Schlup at 327. Petitioner’s burden is to  
11 demonstrate that more likely than not, any reasonable juror would have reasonable doubt. House  
12 v. Bell, 547 U.S. 518, 538 (2006). See Sawyer v. Whitley, 505 U.S. 333, 346 (1992) (holding  
13 that in order to prove actual innocence, petitioner must show fair probability that rational trier of  
14 fact would have entertained reasonable doubt regarding the existence of facts which are  
15 prerequisites under state or federal law for imposition of the death penalty).

16       ii.       *State Law Aider/Abettor*

17       California law requires an aider and abettor to share the specific intent of the perpetrator.  
18 Beeman, 35 Cal.3d at 560. An aider and abettor shares the perpetrator’s specific intent by  
19 knowing the full extent of the perpetrator’s criminal purpose and giving aid or encouragement  
20 with the intent or purpose of facilitating the commission of the crime. Id. California’s 1978  
21 death penalty statute requires finding an independent intent to kill as part of the special  
22 circumstance for an aider or abettor of felony-murder. People v. Anderson, 43 Cal. 3d 1104,  
23 1141-42 (1987). This is consistent with the Eighth Amendment which prohibits the death  
24 penalty for an aider and abettor of felony murder who does not actually kill, attempt to kill,  
25 intend that a killing or lethal force occur, or act with reckless indifference to human life.  
26 Enmund v. Florida, 458 U.S. 782, 797 (1982); Tison v. Arizona, 481 U.S. 137, 157-58 (1987).  
27 Federal court review of instructional error under Beeman is subject to the standard from Brech,  
28

1 507 U.S. at 637, whether the error had a substantial or injurious effect on the verdict.

2       **b.     Review of Claims 2 and 4**

3       The California Supreme Court denied these claims as raised in Petitioner's state petition  
4 for habeas corpus (State Petition for Habeas Corpus, hereinafter "SHCP" or "SPet.", Claims A &  
5 B), to the extent they duplicated sufficiency of evidence claims rejected on appeal.

6       To the extent Petitioner's actual innocence claims are free standing claims based on the  
7 state record, they fail for the reasons stated in claims 1 and 3. To the extent these claims are free  
8 standing claims based on alleged newly discovered evidence, the claims not cognizable (see  
9 Herrera, 506 U.S. at 400) (the Supreme Court held that free standing claims of "actual innocence  
10 based on newly discovered evidence have never been held to state a ground for federal habeas  
11 relief absent an independent constitutional violation occurring in the underlying state criminal  
12 proceeding.").

13       The actual innocence claims also fail as gateway claims because it is not likely any  
14 reasonable juror would have reasonable doubt that the essential elements of the criminal counts  
15 could have been found beyond a reasonable doubt. Petitioner's statements to jailhouse informant  
16 Hernandez, Detective Stratton and reporter Trihey, and the physical evidence in the Bocanegra  
17 home all are substantial evidence of his guilt.

18       Hernandez's testimony at both preliminary hearing and penalty phase that the altercation  
19 between Mr. Bocanegra and Joey started in the hallway and moved to the kitchen is consistent  
20 with the bloodstain evidence. (CT 355-383; 479, 487-488, 500-501; RT 2843-2845) and other  
21 crime scene evidence. (CT 355-380.) His preliminary hearing testimony that Petitioner heard  
22 Joey and Mr. Bocanegra arguing, "walked into the house, tried to break 'em up" (CT 479) and  
23 that he (Petitioner) hit Mr. Bocanegra with the bar is not materially inconsistent with  
24 Hernandez's penalty phase testimony that Petitioner grabbed and held Mr. Bocanegra until Joey  
25 got the knife and that Petitioner beat Mr. Bocanegra with a bar.

26       Hernandez testimony at the preliminary hearing and the penalty phase was consistent that  
27 during Joey's struggles with Mr. Bocanegra, Petitioner struck Mr. Bocanegra with a bar (CT  
28

1 479-482, 500-501, RT 2843-2844, 2854), and that he grabbed or “rushed” Mrs. Bocanegra and  
2 told Joey to “shut her up” during his struggles with Mrs. Bocanegra (CT 483, 504; RT 2844).  
3 Petitioner saw Joey wield a knife during these assaults. (CT 483, 487-489, 504; SPet. Ex. 419, 5,  
4 17; RT 121-122.) Mr. Bocanegra and Mrs. Bocanegra succumbed to the multiple stab wounds.  
5 (CT 112-119.)

6 As to the Batman homicide, Hernandez’s preliminary hearing testimony that Petitioner  
7 and Joey “hit a black guy in an alley” (CT 488, 497-99) is not, as Petitioner alleges, inconsistent  
8 with penalty phase testimony that Petitioner and two other men entered Mr. Batman’s room at  
9 the Bakersfield Inn, and beat him, and the other two stabbed Mr. Batman with a screwdriver, and  
10 that they took Mr. Batman’s money. There is no evidence Hernandez’s testimony at the  
11 preliminary hearing related to the same incident he testified to at the penalty phase.

12 Petitioner’s assertion that there were actually 3 non-victim shoeprints in the kitchen  
13 where Mr. Bocanegra was murdered, so as to implicate Reyes in the Bocanegra murders is not  
14 sufficiently supported in the record. As discussed in claims 8 and 10, *post*, the state court could  
15 reasonably have found that the bloodstain evidence and testimony of Hernandez contradicts  
16 jailhouse informant Seeley’s account that Petitioner observed Mr. Bocanegra’s murder from the  
17 hallway.

18 No facts or discrepancies between the testimony and the physical evidence establish or  
19 compel the conclusion that Hernandez, by virtue of his alleged substance addiction, his plea deal,  
20 or otherwise, was motivated to and did testify falsely or inaccurately. (See claim 7, *ante*.)  
21 Petitioner has not demonstrated Hernandez received undisclosed sentence concession(s). (SPet.  
22 Ex. 900, pp. 4, 11; SResp. Ex. B.)

23 In contrast, the testimony of jailhouse informant Seeley inculpating Reyes in the murders,  
24 is inconsistent with the physical evidence. Seeley’s testimony that the altercation with Mr.  
25 Bocanegra started and ended in the kitchen (SPet. Ex. 419, pp.5-6, 17-20) is not reasonably  
26 consistent with the blood stain patterns that suggest the assault on Mr. Bocanegra began in the  
27 hallway. (CT 355-383.)

1        The physical evidence, Petitioner's statements to Detective Stratton, and Petitioner's  
2 statements to Reporter Trihey are not persuasive of actual innocence for the reasons discussed in  
3 claims 10, 12, 15 and 27, *post*.

4        Petitioner alleges his severe neurological and psychiatric impairments precluded him  
5 from planning the murder and carrying out the plan. But as explained in claim 6, there is no  
6 sufficient evidence that Petitioner suffered from neurological or psychiatric impairment  
7 precluding, as an aider and abettor, his knowingly and intentionally assisting Joey in the  
8 Bocanegra murders.

9        Finally, Petitioner's assertion that he merely restrained Mrs. Bocanegra is nonetheless  
10 sufficient to support a first degree murder conviction as an aider and abettor, especially given  
11 that Petitioner had just observed Joey stab his father to death. (CT 483; RT 2843-2854.) It could  
12 reasonably be concluded that Petitioner's restraining Mrs. Bocanegra just after Mr. Bocanegra's  
13 murder satisfied the requirement that an aider or abettor knows the full extent of the perpetrator's  
14 criminal purpose and gives aid to facilitate the commission of the crime. Beeman, 35 Cal. 3d at  
15 560.

16       For the reasons stated, a fair-minded jurist could conclude it unlikely any reasonable juror  
17 would have reasonable doubt that the essential elements of the criminal counts against Petitioner  
18 could have been found beyond a reasonable doubt.

19       The California Supreme Court's denial of these claims was not contrary to, or an  
20 unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law, or based on an unreasonable  
21 determination of the facts in light of the evidence presented in the state court proceeding. See 28  
22 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

23       Claims 2 and 4 are denied.

24       3.       State Appellate Error - Claim 5

25       In this claim Petitioner alleges that the California Supreme Court committed appellate  
26 review error by making an unconstitutional change in the definition of first degree murder (Cal.  
27 Pen. Code 189) violating the Fifth, Sixth, Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments.

1                   **a.      Clearly Established Law**

2                   A defendant has a due process right to fair notice of the elements of the crime for which  
3 he was convicted. Bouie v. City of Columbia, 378 U.S. 347, 352 (1964).

4                   A state's capital punishment scheme must "minimize the risk of wholly arbitrary and  
5 capricious action." Gregg v. Georgia, 428 U.S. 153, 189 (1976).

6                   Absent specific constitutional error, federal habeas review is limited to determining  
7 whether the state supreme court's statutory review was "so arbitrary and capricious as to  
8 constitute an independent due process or Eighth Amendment violation." Lewis v. Jeffers, 497  
9 U.S. 764, 780 (1990), citing Donnelly v. DeChristoforo, 416 U.S. 637, 642-43 (1974) (absent a  
10 specific constitutional violation, federal habeas review of trial error is limited to whether the  
11 error "so infected the trial with unfairness as to make the resulting conviction a denial of due  
12 process). The essential function of state appellate court jurisdiction is to ensure "evenhanded,  
13 rational, and consistent imposition of death sentences under law." Campbell v. Blodgett, 997  
14 F.2d 512, 522 at n.12 (9th Cir. 1992), citing Pulley v. Harris, 465 U.S. 37, 45 (1984).

15                   **b.      Review of Claim 5**

16                   Petitioner contends that the state supreme court retroactively eliminated the distinction  
17 between intentional first and second degree murders. He reasons this is so because, prior to his  
18 appeal, California law required that premeditated and deliberated first degree murder be shown  
19 to be the "result of careful thought and weighing of considerations," and that conversely "a  
20 sudden killing in the course of an argument and struggle" would not be premeditated and  
21 deliberated murder. See People v. Lasko, 23 Cal.4th 101, 104 (2000); see Anderson, 70 Cal. 2d  
22 at 26-27 (stating types of evidence which might support a finding of premeditation and  
23 deliberation). Yet here, he claims, the trial court found the murder of Mr. Bocanegra satisfied  
24 the premeditation and deliberation standard even though the killer formed the intent to kill during  
25 the fatal altercation and killed with a weapon found at hand. Petitioner alleges there was no  
26 evidence of planning activity, no evidence of a preexisting motive, and that multiple stab wounds  
27 alone are insufficient to prove premeditation and deliberation. See People v. Caldwell, 43 Cal.

1 2d 864, 869 (1955).

2       The state supreme court denied this claim when raised in “supplement to existing habeas  
3 corpus petition” (claim ZZ), In re Sanchez, S049502, (DD), because that court found substantial  
4 evidence that Joey intended to kill his parents and that Petitioner could be found vicariously  
5 liable for these murders as an aider and abettor, as follows:

6       Joey's actions, according to defendant's statements to prosecution witnesses,  
7 indicated that Joey deliberated over his father's killing. Joey initially struck Juan  
8 in the hallway and then, in the kitchen, obtained a knife that he used to stab Juan.  
9 In our view, Joey formed a clear intent to kill, at the latest, during the altercation  
10 with his father, and obtained a kitchen knife to carry out that plan. Our cases hold  
11 that planning activity occurring over a short period of time is sufficient to find  
12 premeditation. “The true test is not the duration of time as much as it is the extent  
13 of the reflection. Thoughts may follow each other with great rapidity and cold,  
14 calculated judgment may be arrived at quickly . . . .” [Citation]

15       There was also ample evidence of motive. The evidence supports a strong  
16 inference that Joey entered his parents' house to rob them. When his father  
17 resisted the robbery, Joey was motivated to murder him in order to gain access to  
18 both money and tangible goods, including a television set. Substantial evidence  
19 supports a finding that Joey believed Juan stood in the way of his plan.

20       Finally, the trial court could infer from the evidence that the manner of killing  
21 tended to demonstrate Joey acted with premeditation and deliberation. The attack  
22 occurred in a series of rooms, indicating that Juan's repeated attempts to break  
23 away from his murderers were consistently thwarted by the attackers' relentless  
24 pursuit of him, even after he was gravely wounded. A rational finder of fact could  
25 infer that the manner of killing, when combined with Joey's retrieval of the knife  
26 in the kitchen, and defendant's retrieval of a metal bar used in clubbing a  
27 defenseless Juan, is sufficient to support the trier of fact's implied finding that  
28 Joey formed the plan to kill his parents during the altercation, located the murder  
weapon, and along with defendant, deliberately murdered his father. [Citation]

29       The same evidence supports the trial court's finding that defendant shared Joey's  
30 intent and plan to kill Juan, and thus was liable, as an aider and abettor, for Juan's  
31 murder. [Citation] The killing of Juan ended after a prolonged knife attack and  
32 beating from which Juan attempted to defend himself. Defendant's personal  
33 involvement in the murder was substantial. Far from merely acting as a lookout,  
34 or beating Juan after he was already dead, defendant was actively involved in  
35 assisting Joey in Juan's murder. Defendant's admitted act of arming himself with a  
36 curved metal bar before joining the altercation between Joey and Juan indicates he  
37 shared Joey's plan. [Citation] From this evidence, the trier of fact could  
38 reasonably infer defendant knowingly engaged or assisted in Juan's murder as an  
39 aider and abettor.

40       Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 33-34.

41       The Court finds that, contrary to Petitioner assertion, and for the reasons discussed in  
42

1 claims 1-4, the state court's analysis could reasonably rely upon evidence before it of a pre-  
2 existing motive to obtain money from Mr. Bocanegra, involving a joint criminal design of  
3 multiple and prolonged stab wounds, aided and abetted by Petitioner's participation with the  
4 metal bar, sufficient to find premeditation and deliberation both by Joey and Petitioner. Id.  
5 Given the state court's analysis and the record, there appears to be no risk of arbitrary and  
6 capricious verdict.

7 This Court does not find the state court rejection of the claim was contrary to, or an  
8 unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law, as determined by the Supreme  
9 Court, or that the state court's ruling was based on an unreasonable determination of the facts in  
10 light of the evidence presented in the state court proceeding, viewed most favoring the  
11 prosecution, Jackson, 443 U.S. at 319. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d); Lewis, 497 U.S. at 780 (absent  
12 a specific constitutional error, federal habeas review is limited to determining whether the state  
13 Supreme Court's performance of its statutory review was "so arbitrary and capricious as to  
14 constitute an independent due process or Eighth Amendment violation.")

15 Claim 5 is denied.

16 4. Ineffective Assistance of Counsel in Guilt And Special Circumstance Phase -  
17 Claims 6 through 18

18 In claims 6 through 18, Petitioner alleges various instances during the guilt and special  
19 circumstance phase where defense counsel provided ineffective assistance.

20 Eugene Toton ("Toton") was appointed as lead defense counsel. Gary Frank ("Frank")  
21 was appointed as defense co-counsel. By their agreement, Toton was responsible for the guilt  
22 and special circumstance phase and Frank was responsible for the penalty phase. (SHCP Exhs.  
23 113, ¶ 4; 137, ¶ 3.) The record before the state court does not demonstrate that defense attorney  
24 Frank performed any substantial defense function during the guilty and special circumstance  
25 phase.

26 a. Clearly Established Law

27 The Sixth Amendment right to effective assistance of counsel, applicable to the states

1 through the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, applies through the sentencing  
2 phase of a trial. See Murray, 745 F.3d at 1010-11: U.S. Const. amend. VI; U.S. Const. amend.  
3 XIV, § 1; Gideon v. Wainwright, 372 U.S. 335, 343-45 (1963); Silva v. Woodford, 279 F.3d  
4 825, 836 (9th Cir. 2002).

5 The Supreme Court explained the legal standard for assessing a claim of ineffective  
6 assistance of counsel in Strickland v. Washington, 466 U.S. 668, 685-87 (1984). Strickland  
7 propounded a two prong test for analysis of claims of ineffective assistance of counsel. First, the  
8 petitioner must show that counsel's performance was deficient, requiring a showing that counsel  
9 made errors so serious that he or she was not functioning as the "counsel" guaranteed by the  
10 Sixth Amendment. Strickland, 466 U.S. at 687. The petitioner must show that "counsel's  
11 representation fell below an objective standard of reasonableness," and must identify counsel's  
12 alleged acts or omissions that were not the result of reasonable professional judgment  
13 considering the circumstances. Richter, 562 U.S. at 104 (citing Strickland, 466 U.S. at 688);  
14 United States v. Quintero-Barraza, 78 F.3d 1344, 1348 (9th Cir. 1995).

15 Petitioner must show that counsel's errors were so egregious as to deprive defendant of a  
16 fair trial, one whose result is reliable. Strickland, 466 U.S. at 688. Judicial scrutiny of counsel's  
17 performance is highly deferential, and the habeas court must guard against the temptation "to  
18 second-guess counsel's assistance after conviction or adverse sentence." Id. at 689. Instead, the  
19 habeas court must make every effort "to eliminate the distorting effects of hindsight, to  
20 reconstruct the circumstances of counsel's challenged conduct, and to evaluate the conduct from  
21 counsel's perspective at the time." Id.; see also Richter, 562 U.S. at 107. A court indulges a  
22 "'strong presumption' that counsel's representation was within the 'wide range' of reasonable  
23 professional assistance." Richter, 562 U.S. at 104 (quoting Strickland, 466 U.S. at 687); Sanders  
24 v. Ratelle, 21 F.3d 1446, 1456 (9th Cir. 1994). This presumption of reasonableness means that  
25 not only do we "give the attorneys the benefit of the doubt," we must also "affirmatively  
26 entertain the range of possible reasons [defense] counsel may have had for proceeding as they  
27 did." Pinholster, 131 S. Ct. at 1407.

1       The Supreme Court has “declined to articulate specific guidelines for appropriate  
 2 attorney conduct and instead ha[s] emphasized that ‘[t]he proper measure of attorney  
 3 performance remains simply reasonableness under prevailing professional norms.’” Wiggins v.  
 4 Smith, 539 U.S. 510, 521 (2003) (quoting Strickland, 466 U.S. at 688). However, “general  
 5 principles have emerged regarding the duties of criminal defense attorneys that inform [a court's]  
 6 view as to the ‘objective standard of reasonableness’ by which [a court must] assess attorney  
 7 performance, particularly with respect to the duty to investigate.” Summerlin v. Schriro, 427  
 8 F.3d 623, 629 (9th Cir. 2005). “[S]trategic choices made after thorough investigation of law and  
 9 facts relevant to plausible options are virtually unchallengeable.” Strickland, 466 U.S. at 690.

10       However, strategic choices made after less than complete investigation are reasonable  
 11 precisely to the extent that reasonable professional judgments support the limitations on  
 12 investigation. In other words, counsel has a duty to make reasonable investigations or to make a  
 13 reasonable decision that makes particular investigations unnecessary. In any ineffectiveness  
 14 case, a particular decision not to investigate must be directly assessed for reasonableness in all  
 15 the circumstances, applying a heavy measure of deference to counsel's judgment. Wiggins, 539  
 16 U.S. at 521 (quoting Strickland, 466 U.S. at 690–91); see also Thomas v. Chappell, 678 F.3d  
 17 1086, 1104 (9th Cir. 2012) (counsel's decision not to call a witness can only be considered  
 18 tactical if he had “sufficient information with which to make an informed decision”); Reynoso v.  
 19 Giurbino, 462 F.3d 1099, 1112–1115 (9th Cir. 2006) (counsel's failure to cross-examine  
 20 witnesses about their knowledge of reward money cannot be considered strategic where counsel  
 21 did not investigate this avenue of impeachment); Jennings v. Woodford, 290 F.3d 1006, 1016  
 22 (9th Cir. 2002) (counsel's choice of alibi defense and rejection of mental health defense not  
 23 reasonable strategy where counsel failed to investigate possible mental defenses).

24       Second, the petitioner must demonstrate prejudice, that is, he must show that “there is a  
 25 reasonable probability that, but for counsel's unprofessional errors, the result . . . would have  
 26 been different.” Strickland, 466 U.S. at 694. “It is not enough ‘to show that the errors had some  
 27 conceivable effect on the outcome of the proceeding.’” Richter, 562 U.S. at 104 (quoting

1 Strickland, 466 U.S. at 693). “Counsel’s errors must be ‘so serious as to deprive the defendant  
2 of a fair trial, a trial whose result is reliable.’” Id. (quoting Strickland, 466 U.S. at 687). Under  
3 this standard, we ask “whether it is ‘reasonably likely’ the result would have been different.”  
4 Richter, 562 U.S. at 111 (quoting Strickland, 466 U.S. at 696).

5 That is, only when “[t]he likelihood of a different result [is] substantial, not just  
6 conceivable,” id., has the defendant met Strickland’s demand that defense errors were “so serious  
7 as to deprive the defendant of a fair trial.” Id., at 104 (quoting Strickland, 466 U.S. at 687). A  
8 court need not determine whether counsel’s performance was deficient before examining the  
9 prejudice suffered by the petitioner as a result of the alleged deficiencies. Strickland, 466 U.S. at  
10 697. Since the defendant must affirmatively prove prejudice, any deficiency that does not result  
11 in prejudice must necessarily fail.

12 Under the AEDPA, the Court does not apply Strickland de novo. Rather, the Court must  
13 determine whether the state court’s application of Strickland was unreasonable. Richter, 562  
14 U.S. at 99-100. Establishing that a state court’s application of Strickland was unreasonable  
15 under 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d) is very difficult. Richter, 562 U.S. at 100. Since the standards  
16 created by Strickland and § 2254(d) are both “highly deferential” when the two are applied in  
17 tandem, review is “doubly” so. Richter, 562 U.S. at 105 (quoting Knowles v. Mirzayance, 556  
18 U.S. 111, 123 (2009)). Further, because the Strickland rule is a “general” one, courts have “more  
19 leeway . . . in reaching outcomes in case-by-case determinations” and the “range of reasonable  
20 applications is substantial.” Id. at 101; Promo v. Moore, 562 U.S. 115, 127 (2011).

21 If the petitioner makes an insufficient showing as to either one of the two Strickland  
22 components, the reviewing court need not address the other component. Strickland, 466 U.S. at  
23 697.

24 **b. Review of Claim 6**

25 In this claim, Petitioner alleges ineffective assistance of counsel by failure to investigate  
26 and present evidence of mental state defenses, violating his Fifth, Sixth, Eighth and Fourteenth  
27 Amendment rights.

1 Petitioner raised this claim in his state petition for habeas corpus. (SPet. claim C.) The  
2 California Supreme Court summarily denied the claim in a decision unaccompanied by  
3 explanation. In re Sanchez, S049502 (DD.) In such a case where the state court denied  
4 Petitioner's state petition for habeas corpus without an explanation, "the habeas petitioner's  
5 burden still must be met by showing there was no reasonable basis for the state court to deny  
6 relief," Richter, 562 U.S. at 98, and this Court "must determine what arguments or theories  
7 supported or . . . *could have supported*, the state court's decision; and then it must ask whether it  
8 is possible fair-minded jurists could disagree that those arguments or theories are inconsistent  
9 with the holding in a prior decision of this Court." Id. (emphasis added).

10 Petitioner contends that a reasonable investigation would have revealed his organic brain  
11 difficulties and psychiatric impairments relating to childhood abuse and trauma and deprivations  
12 and his long history of substance abuse. During the week prior to the homicides, Petitioner  
13 alleges he drank alcohol and smoked PCP continually and in large amounts, triggering a post-  
14 traumatic stress reaction, precluding his forming an intent to kill and premeditation and  
15 deliberation during the Bocanegra homicides. He claims his substance abuse led to long-term  
16 brain dysfunction. (SHCP Ex. 114, ¶¶ 67-70.)

17 The evidence proffered by Petitioner suggests chronic substance abuse beginning as early  
18 as 1977. (SPet. Exhs. 105, pp. 64-65, 74-75; 110, p. 1; 119, p. 8; 123, p. 1; and 128, at pp. 1-2.)  
19 Petitioner offers evidence that he engaged in substance abuse during the weeks prior to the  
20 murders. (SPet. Ex. 105, pp. 85-87.) However, Respondent correctly notes the absence of  
21 competent evidence that Petitioner ingested and/or was under the influence of phencyclidine,  
22 marijuana, or alcohol on the days the Bocanegra and Batman murders occurred. Based on the  
23 record before it, the state court could reasonably have found that Petitioner was not under the  
24 influence of phencyclidine (PCP), marijuana, or alcohol at the time of the Bocanegra and Batman  
25 murders.

26 The state court could have reasonably concluded that Petitioner' statements to jailhouse  
27 informant Hernandez (CT 479-484, 487-489, 495, 500-505), detective Stratton (CT 77-78), and  
28

1 reporter Trihey (RT 16-20; 175-181; SPet. Exhs. 700-701) demonstrated Petitioner's intentional  
2 and deliberate aiding and abetting of Joey in the Bocanegra murders. This being the case, a  
3 tactical decision not to investigate and present such a defense could be reasonable where  
4 evidence is lacking, or it could go toward aggravation. See Strickland, 466 U.S. at 690-91.

5 Post-offenses jail records and medications Petitioner allegedly was given while  
6 incarcerated (SHCP Exhs. 601, 602) do not show his emotional and mental state at the time of  
7 the crimes.

8 Defense psychologist Donaldson, who evaluated Petitioner in May 1987, found that  
9 although there were indications of organic difficulties in perceptual motor integration, Petitioner  
10 was of average intelligence. Specifically, Donaldson stated that:

11  
12 There were no indications through the testing of deficits in reality testing, nor of a  
13 thought disorder of any kind. There were no indications of significant anxiety or  
depression. In spite of his socially and educationally deprived background . . . Mr.  
Petitioner is a highly sociopathic individual.

14 (SPet. Ex. 106, pp. 1-2.)

15 Petitioner claims effective counsel would have been aware of the evidence showing  
16 serious mental problems and would have investigated this evidence. He points to a 1995  
17 neuropsychological evaluation by psychologist Froming finding severe diffuse organic brain  
18 damage and localized brain dysfunction. (SHCP Ex. 114, ¶¶ 39-60.) He points to post-offense  
19 jail records which showed continuing mental problems including paranoia, depression, stress,  
20 insomnia, inability to eat and a suicide attempt, and that he was given medication for these  
21 conditions. He also notes his 1995 evaluation by defense psychiatrist, Dr. Foster, finding  
22 depression, mental impairment and post-traumatic stress disorders from childhood trauma and  
23 deprivation of basic necessities, exacerbated by substance abuse, all possibly extending back to  
24 the time of the instant homicides. (SHCP Ex. 111, ¶¶ 16-17, 20-23, 79-95.) He alleges defense  
25 counsel missed this opportunity to show lack of premeditation and deliberation, and also  
26 mistakenly believed voluntary intoxication would be no defense to felony murder. He further  
27 alleges that his impairments made him more likely to follow counsel's advice to waive a full  
28

1 defense and also affected his ability to understand the consequences of doing so.

2        Respondent views these allegations as speculation. Respondent contends that Petitioner's  
3 statements to reporter Trihey did not necessarily imply that Petitioner believed his dead mother  
4 was alive. Respondent contends that Hernandez's observation that Petitioner was suicidal is  
5 mere conjecture. Respondent contends that the 1995 opinions of psychiatrist Foster and  
6 psychologist Froming of a high probability of mental disorders and impairments at the time of  
7 the crimes and subsequent trial are likewise speculation and surmise.

8        This Court agrees that Petitioner's proffer is not sufficient evidence of mental impairment  
9 at the time of the murders and subsequent trial. As discussed in claims 1-4, *ante*, the substantial  
10 evidence shows Petitioner knowingly and intentionally assisted Joey in the Bocanegra murders  
11 and confessed the same to reporter Trihey. Significantly, Petitioner told detective Boggs of his  
12 involvement in the Batman murder (CT 288-320) and acknowledged that "he was going to prison  
13 for the rest of his life anyway" for his role in the Bocanegra murders. (CT 314.)

14       The Court does not find post-custody psychological and psychiatric reports sufficient  
15 evidence that, at the time of the crimes and trial thereon, Petitioner suffered neurological or  
16 psychological impairments. Significantly, there is no evidence defense psychiatrist Donaldson  
17 recommended to Toton that a neuropsychological evaluation be performed. Psychiatrist  
18 Matychowiak, following his November 1987 court-ordered examination, found that Petitioner  
19 was not suicidal or delusional or suffering memory gaps (SPet. Ex. 520, p. 5); that Petitioner  
20 planned to tell the judge he was guilty (id. at 2); and that Petitioner understood the proceedings  
21 and could cooperate with counsel. (Id. at 6.) Petitioner told Matychowiak that he planned to tell  
22 the jury he was guilty and "get it over with." (SPet. Ex. 520, p. 2.) Dr. Matychowiak found  
23 Petitioner competent to stand trial.

24       Additionally, Petitioner cannot establish prejudice from defense counsel's alleged  
25 ineffectiveness because a change in the outcome had mental defenses been further investigated  
26 and presented is not reasonably likely given the substantial evidence against him and his  
27 expressed desire to plead guilty. That is, mental state defenses would not have been sufficient to  
28

1 undermine confidence in the trial outcome. See U.S. v. Lewis, 786 F.2d 1278, 1283 (5th Cir.  
2 1986). Defense psychologist Donaldson found Petitioner to be of average intelligence and  
3 though there were indications in perceptual motor integration, no deficits in reality testing or  
4 thought disorder was detected. (SPet. Ex. 106, p.2.) Court appointed psychiatrist Matychowiak  
5 came to essentially the same conclusions. (SPet. Ex. 520, p.1; CT 646.) Toton could reasonably  
6 have believed Donaldson's negative findings were not relevant at the guilt and special  
7 circumstance phase. (SPet. Ex. 137, p. 2.)

8 Petitioner never alleged during trial proceedings that he was mentally impaired or that he  
9 did not knowingly participate in the homicides. Rather he admitted his knowing participation to  
10 reporter Trihey (RT 181; see SPet. Exhs. 700-701), detective Stratton (CT 77-78) and informant  
11 Hernandez (CT 479-484, 487-489). Such a defense was contrary to Petitioner's stated desire to  
12 plead guilty to the Bocanegra murders (SPet. Ex. 520, pp. 2-4) and "dying for his crimes but  
13 dying with a clear conscience" (SPet. Ex. 700). In fact, Petitioner proceeded to waive jury trial  
14 on the guilt and special circumstances phase and submit on the preliminary hearing transcript and  
15 testimony of additional prosecution witnesses. (See Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 23-30.) The  
16 evidence does not suggest a reasonable probability that Petitioner would have agreed to go  
17 forward on a mental defense, or that if he had, it would have been successful given his  
18 incriminating statements.

19 For the reasons stated, a fair-minded jurist could have found that Petitioner failed to  
20 establish that defense counsel's performance fell below an objective standard of reasonableness  
21 and that, but for counsel's unprofessional errors, the result of the proceeding would have been  
22 different. Strickland, 466 U.S., at 687-694.

23 It does not appear that the state court rejection of the claim was contrary to, or an  
24 unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law, as determined by the Supreme  
25 Court, or that the state court's ruling was based on an unreasonable determination of the facts in  
26 light of the evidence presented in the state court proceeding. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

27 Claim 6 is denied.

28

1                   **c.       Review of Claim 7**

2                   Petitioner alleges ineffective assistance of counsel by failure to investigate and impeach  
3 informant Hernandez, the principal witness against him, violating his Fifth, Sixth, Eighth and  
4 Fourteenth Amendment rights.

5                   The California Supreme Court summarily denied this claim (SPet. Claim D) raised in  
6 Petitioner's state petition for habeas corpus. In re Sanchez, S049502 (DD.) As noted, in such a  
7 case "the habeas petitioner's burden still must be met by showing there was no reasonable basis  
8 for the state court to deny relief," Richter, 562 U.S. at 98, and this Court "must determine what  
9 arguments or theories supported or . . . *could have supported*, the state court's decision; and then  
10 it must ask whether it is possible fair-minded jurists could disagree that those arguments or  
11 theories are inconsistent with the holding in a prior decision of this Court." Id. (emphasis  
12 added).

13                  Petitioner claims that, though Hernandez's history of drug abuse and heroin addiction  
14 was available to defense counsel, counsel deficiently failed to investigate these matters or  
15 interview Hernandez. (SHCP Exhs. 137, ¶ 12; 113, ¶ 11.) This even though Hernandez's  
16 allegedly inconsistent testimony may have been related to drug use and the plea deal he received  
17 in exchange for his testimony. Petitioner claims additional evidence discovered might have  
18 motivated Toton to put on a full defense. (SHCP Ex. 137, ¶ 18.)

19                  This Court is unconvinced. For the reasons and upon consideration of the evidence  
20 discussed in claims 1 through 4, *ante*, the state court could reasonably have determined there was  
21 no basis upon which Petitioner could have effectively impeached Hernandez. Petitioner has not  
22 shown that Hernandez gave materially contradictory, inconsistent or false testimony, or that  
23 Hernandez was motivated by an undisclosed plea bargain. No facts or discrepancies between the  
24 testimony and the physical evidence establish or compel the conclusion that Hernandez, by virtue  
25 of his alleged substance addiction, his plea deal, or otherwise, was motivated to and did testify  
26 falsely or inaccurately. (SPet. Ex. 900, pp. 4, 11; SResp. Ex. B.)

27                  Defense counsel Toton could have made a reasoned tactical decision not to interview  
28

1 Hernandez. Having cross-examined Hernandez at the preliminary hearing, Toton determined on  
2 that basis not to interview him. (SPet. Ex. 137, pp. 3-4.) Moreover, Toton did ask Hernandez  
3 about any undisclosed plea deal during cross-examination in the guilt and special circumstances  
4 phase. Hernandez's testimony was consistent with Petitioner's statements and the physical  
5 evidence, that he had not been offered any disposition of then pending criminal matters prior to  
6 agreeing to testify at the Petitioner prosecution. (CT 576-577.) Toton later cross-examined  
7 Hernandez during the penalty phase. Hernandez admitted a deal on a then pending charge in  
8 exchange for his testimony in Petitioner's proceeding. (RT 2850-2851.) The Court does not find  
9 that Hernandez's testimony was false or misleading in this regard.

10 Defense counsel Frank was not responsible for the guilt and special circumstance phase.  
11 It was not unreasonable that Frank did not interview Hernandez relative to his statements therein.  
12 (SPet. Ex. 113, p. 4.)

13 Additionally, given the speculative nature of impeachment, Petitioner's desire to plead  
14 guilty, and the incriminating evidence, all as discussed in claims 1-4, *ante*, Petitioner was not  
15 prejudiced from any allegedly deficient performance. There was not a reasonable probability of  
16 a different outcome from further attempted impeachment of Hernandez.

17 Also, such a defense was contrary to Petitioner's stated desire to plead guilty to the  
18 Bocanegra murders (SPet. Ex. 520, p. 2) and "dying for his crimes but dying with a clear  
19 conscience" (SPet. Ex. 700). Petitioner waived jury trial and submitted the guilt and special  
20 circumstances phase on the preliminary hearing transcript and on the testimony of additional  
21 prosecution witnesses. See Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 23-30. The evidence does not suggest a  
22 reasonable probability impeachment would have been successful given his incriminating  
23 statements to detective Stratton and reporter Trihey and the crime scene evidence corroborated  
24 by Hernandez's testimony. (See claims 1-4, *ante*.)

25 For the reasons stated, it is clear that a fair-minded jurist could have found that Petitioner  
26 failed to establish that defense counsel's performance fell below an objective standard of  
27 reasonableness and that, but for counsel's unprofessional errors, the result of the proceeding  
28

1 would have been different. Strickland, 466 U.S., at 687-694.

2 It does not appear that the state court rejection of the claim was contrary to, or an  
3 unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law, as determined by the Supreme  
4 Court, or that the state court's ruling was based on an unreasonable determination of the facts in  
5 light of the evidence presented in the state court proceeding. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

6 Claim 7 is denied.

7 **d. Review of Claim 8**

8 Petitioner claims ineffective assistance of counsel by failure to investigate and present  
9 testimony of jailhouse informant Seeley, violating his Sixth, Eighth and Fourteenth Amendment  
10 rights.

11 The California Supreme Court summarily denied this claim (SPet. Claim E) raised in  
12 Petitioner's state petition for habeas corpus. In re Sanchez, S049502 (DD.) As noted, in such a  
13 case "the habeas petitioner's burden still must be met by showing there was no reasonable basis  
14 for the state court to deny relief," Richter, 562 U.S. at 98, and this Court "must determine what  
15 arguments or theories supported or . . . could have supported, the state court's decision; and then  
16 it must ask whether it is possible fair-minded jurists could disagree that those arguments or  
17 theories are inconsistent with the holding in a prior decision of this Court." Id. (emphasis  
18 added).

19 Petitioner claims that Seeley had conversations both with him and Reyes and would have  
20 testified that: Reyes was in the Bocanegra home at the time of the their murders; it was Reyes,  
21 not Petitioner, who struck Mr. Bocanegra; that the assault on Mrs. Bocanegra by Petitioner and  
22 Reyes was unconnected to Joey's subsequent killing of her; that Petitioner and Reyes did not  
23 intend to rob the Bocanegras; that Petitioner and Reyes had no plan to kill the Bocanegras; and  
24 that their deaths resulted from the sudden quarrel between Joey and Mr. Bocanegra. (SHCP Ex.  
25 419.) Toton, Petitioner claims, was aware of Seeley's statement, (SHCP Ex. 420), but did not  
26 interview him or investigate. (SHCP Ex. 137, ¶ 12.) This even though counsel for Reyes in his  
27 separate proceedings did attempt to investigate and interview Seeley (SHCP Ex. 136, ¶¶ 7, 8),

28

1 consistent with the local professional practice of interviewing informants. (SHCP Ex. 127 ¶ 6.)

2 This Court finds that the record could reasonably support a tactical decision by Toton not  
3 to investigate Seeley's possibly exculpating testimony. Toton, who had experience with Seeley  
4 on at least one other case, did not believe Seeley had actually spoken with Petitioner (SPet. Ex.  
5 137, ¶ 4), did not believe Seeley was credible, and doubted the prosecution would call Seeley.  
6 (SPet. Ex. 137, p. 4.) Moreover, Seeley's version of events could have been viewed as contrary  
7 to the physical evidence at the Bocanegra crime scene. (SPet. Ex. 419, pp. 5-6, 17; CT 355-382.)  
8 See e.g., Denham v. Deeds, 954 F.2d 1501, 1505-06 (9th Cir. 1992) (defense counsel not  
9 ineffective where decision not to call witness based on inconsistencies in witness's testimony).

10 Seeley's testimony was in some ways more inculpating of Petitioner than were  
11 Hernandez's statements. Under Seeley's version of events, Petitioner actively participated in  
12 attempts to subdue Mrs. Bocanegra. Seeley apparently would have testified that Petitioner struck  
13 several blows to Mrs. Bocanegra's head with a piece of rebar whereupon Joey stabbed her to  
14 death. (SPet. Ex. 419, pp. 6-8, 18-19.) Furthermore, testimony by Seeley likely would have  
15 been subject to rebuttal by significant contrary evidence from Hernandez, Stratton, Trihey, as  
16 well as by the bloodstain evidence and Petitioner's professed desire to plead guilty. All this  
17 likely obviating any prejudice to Petitioner for not investigating and presenting Seeley.

18 Evidence of Petitioner's shoepoint in the kitchen undermines Seeley's July 27, 1987  
19 statements to district attorney investigator Pendleton that Petitioner watched the assault on Mr.  
20 Bocanegra from the hallway. (SPet. Ex. 419.) Seeley's version also could be viewed as  
21 inconsistent with Petitioner's above noted statements to Hernandez and detective Stratton and to  
22 reporter Trihey, where Petitioner omits any mention of Reyes's involvement in the assault by  
23 Joey on Mr. Bocanegra.

24 In addition to these considerations of credibility and corroboration, the record reflects  
25 that Seeley refused to speak with counsel for Reyes, (SPet. Ex. 136, pp.1-3), who characterized  
26 Seeley as "a professional jailhouse snitch." (SPet. Ex. 139, p. 2.) It is uncertain that he would  
27 have agreed to speak with Toton. Even if, as Petitioner alleges, Toton had an unusual practice of  
28

1 not talking to jailhouse informants except on the witness stand, Toton's alleged failure in this  
2 case to investigate and present evidence from Seeley could nonetheless have been a reasonable  
3 trial tactic. Strickland permits counsel to "make a reasonable decision that makes particular  
4 investigations unnecessary." Richter, 562 U.S. at 106 (citing Strickland, 466 U.S. at 691).

5 Accordingly, it was at least arguable that a reasonable attorney could decide to forego  
6 investigation into Seeley's testimony in similar circumstances. Toton was allowed to formulate a  
7 strategy, reasonable at the time, and to balance limited resources consistent with effective trial  
8 tactics and strategies. See Richter, 562 U.S. at 107. Toton was not required to pursue an  
9 investigation that would have been fruitless, or worse, harmful to the defense. Id. at 108.

10 As to defense counsel Frank, he could reasonably have decided not to interview Seeley to  
11 the extent any evidence to be provided by Seeley related only to the guilt and special  
12 circumstances phase, handled by Toton. (See SPet. Ex. 113, p. 4.)

13 This claim, to the extent based on insufficiency of the evidence and actual innocence, is  
14 unpersuasive for reasons discussed in claims 1 through 4, *ante*. For the reasons discussed  
15 therein, Petitioner has not established that Hernandez's testimony was materially unreliable or  
16 inconsistent with the testimony of Stratton and Trihey and the physical evidence found at the  
17 Bocanegra crime scene, or that Hernandez testimony was given in exchange for an undisclosed  
18 favorable (to Hernandez) plea deal.

19 Nor has Petitioner made an evidentiary showing of prejudice. For the reasons discussed  
20 above, the state court could have determined there was no reasonable probability of a different  
21 outcome from investigating Seeley and presenting him as a witness. Fundamentally, such a  
22 defense was contrary to Petitioner's stated desire to plead guilty to the Bocanegra murders,  
23 (SPet. Ex. 520, p. 2), and "dying for his crimes but dying with a clear conscience." (SPet. Ex.  
24 700.) Based on that desire, Petitioner waived jury trial and submitted guilt and special  
25 circumstances phase on the preliminary hearing transcript and the testimony of additional  
26 prosecution witnesses. See Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 23-30; CT 891-892; RT 108a-115a.) The  
27 evidence does not suggest a reasonable probability that impeachment would have been  
28

1 successful given Petitioner's incriminating statements to detective Stratton and reporter Trihey  
2 and the crime scene evidence corroborated by Hernandez's testimony. (See claims 1-4, *ante*.)

3 The Court concludes that a fair-minded jurist could have found that Petitioner failed to  
4 establish that defense counsel's performance fell below an objective standard of reasonableness  
5 and that, but for counsel's unprofessional errors, the result of the proceeding would have been  
6 different. Strickland, 466 U.S., at 687-694.

7 It does not appear that the state court rejection of the claim was contrary to, or an  
8 unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law, as determined by the Supreme  
9 Court, or that the state court's ruling was based on an unreasonable determination of the facts in  
10 light of the evidence presented in the state court proceeding. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

11 Claim 8 is denied.

12 **e. Review of Claim 9**

13 In this claim, Petitioner alleges ineffective assistance of counsel by failure to investigate  
14 and present evidence about Joey, violating his Sixth, Eighth and Fourteenth Amendment rights.

15 The California Supreme Court summarily denied this claim (SPet. Claim F) raised in  
16 Petitioner's state petition for habeas corpus. In re Sanchez, S049502 (DD.) As noted, in such a  
17 case "the habeas petitioner's burden still must be met by showing there was no reasonable basis  
18 for the state court to deny relief," Richter, 562 U.S. at 98, and this Court "must determine what  
19 arguments or theories supported or . . . could have supported, the state court's decision; and then  
20 it must ask whether it is possible fair-minded jurists could disagree that those arguments or  
21 theories are inconsistent with the holding in a prior decision of this Court." Id. (emphasis  
22 added).

23 Petitioner, citing to the declaration of defense investigator Peninger, faults defense  
24 counsel for not investigating and presenting evidence of Joey's violent temper, threats and  
25 assaults against his parents, and smoking PCP the night before the Bocanegra murders. (SHCP  
26 127, ¶ 5.) Petitioner claims such evidence would have shown that a sudden quarrel and a fear of  
27 Joey precipitated the killings rather than premeditation, deliberation and an intent to commit  
28

1 robbery. He bases this claim upon facts allege in claims 1 through 4.

2 The Court is not persuaded. In June, 1988, prior to trial, defense investigator Peninger  
3 interviewed Joey. (SHCP Ex. 127, ¶ 5.) Though Toton conceded he could have investigated  
4 Joey further, and would have done so if a full defense had been mounted, (SHCP Ex. 137, ¶¶ 18,  
5 21, 22), Petitioner waived a full defense.

6 Proffer of evidence that there was no robbery motive would not have changed the  
7 outcome. The trial court's found Petitioner was not guilty of robbery, and found not true the  
8 robbery-murder special circumstance. (CT 906; RT 236-237.) Therefore no prejudice arose from  
9 any failure to investigate and present evidence of Joey's temper and prior assaultive behavior  
10 relating to robbery-murder theory.

11 As discussed in claims 1-8, *ante*, there was sufficient evidence to convict Petitioner of  
12 aiding and abetting first degree murder based upon a finding of premeditation and deliberation.  
13 The state court could reasonably have concluded that, in the face of such substantial evidence of  
14 guilt, it was not reasonably likely that a showing of Joey's temper and prior assaultive conduct  
15 would have raised a reasonable doubt that Petitioner aided and abetted the premeditated and  
16 deliberate murders of Mr. Bocanegra and Mrs. Bocanegra.

17 Petitioner points out that counsel for Reyes, in Reyes's separate proceeding, did  
18 investigate Joey and subpoenaed trial witnesses based thereon. However, this alone does not  
19 suggest that, on the record in this proceeding, Toton's decision not to do so was an unreasonable  
20 trial tactic. Especially so given the above noted substantial evidence of Petitioner's guilt and  
21 Reyes's decision to plead guilty to three counts of first degree murder.

22 Petitioner has not made an evidentiary showing of prejudice, that there is a reasonable  
23 probability of a different outcome from investigating and presenting evidence about Joey. The  
24 state court could reasonably have found that, considering the record before it, evidence about  
25 Joey would not have changed the result. Petitioner gave incriminating statements to detective  
26 Stratton and reporter Trihey, corroborated by the crime scene evidence and Hernandez's  
27 testimony. (See claims 1-4, *ante*.) Here again, such a defense was contrary to Petitioner's stated  
28

1 desire to plead guilty to the Bocanegra murders, (SPet. Ex. 520, p. 2), and “dying for his crimes  
2 but dying with a clear conscience.” (SPet. Ex. 700.) Petitioner waived jury trial and submitted  
3 guilt and special circumstances phase on the preliminary hearing transcript and the testimony of  
4 additional prosecution witnesses. See Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 23-30.

5 Accordingly, a fair-minded jurist could have found that Petitioner failed to establish that  
6 defense counsel’s performance fell below an objective standard of reasonableness and that, but  
7 for counsel’s unprofessional errors, the result of the proceeding would have been different.  
8 Strickland, 466 U.S., at 687-694.

9 It does not appear that the state court rejection of the claim was contrary to, or an  
10 unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law, as determined by the Supreme  
11 Court, or that the state court’s ruling was based on an unreasonable determination of the facts in  
12 light of the evidence presented in the state court proceeding. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

13 Claim 9 is denied.

14 **f. Review of Claim 10**

15 Petitioner next claims ineffective assistance of counsel by failure to investigate and  
16 present physical evidence of Bocanegra murders, violating his Fifth, Sixth, Eighth and  
17 Fourteenth Amendment rights.

18 The California Supreme Court summarily denied this claim (SPet. Claim G) raised in  
19 Petitioner’s state petition for habeas corpus. In re Sanchez, S049502 (DD.) As noted, in such a  
20 case “the habeas petitioner’s burden still must be met by showing there was no reasonable basis  
21 for the state court to deny relief,” Richter, 562 U.S. at 98, and this Court “must determine what  
22 arguments or theories supported or . . . could have supported, the state court’s decision; and then  
23 it must ask whether it is possible fair-minded jurists could disagree that those arguments or  
24 theories are inconsistent with the holding in a prior decision of this Court.” Id. (emphasis  
25 added).

26 Petitioner alleges that supplemental evidence from criminologist Laskowski and coroner  
27 Holloway would have shown three people, Reyes, Petitioner and Joey, were in the Bocanegra  
28

1 house at the time of the murders and that the victims' scalp wounds could have been inflicted by  
2 different assailants using different implements. (SHCP Exhs. 417, pp.1-2; 120, ¶ 6-7.)  
3 Petitioner reasons this supplemental evidence would have rebutted the prosecution theory that  
4 only Petitioner and Joey were present in the Bocanegra home at the time of the murders, and  
5 would have caused defense counsel to take the matter to full trial on guilt, (SHCP Ex. 137, pp. 6-  
6 7) and thereby increased possibility of a negotiated plea more favorable than the conviction and  
7 sentence handed down.

8 The Court finds this claim unavailing. The evidence in the state record is consistent with  
9 Reyes, at some point, entering the Bocanegra home. Evidence of Reyes's bloody hand print on  
10 the front doorknob was admitted at Petitioner's preliminary hearing. (CT 202-203.)

11 Petitioner is correct that criminologist Laskowski testified at preliminary hearing to only  
12 two shoe tread patterns found at the Bocanegra crime scene, and that Laskowski (during his  
13 subsequent preparation for the separate Reyes trial) identified a third shoe tread pattern in the  
14 kitchen of the Bocanegra residence. However, Reyes admitted in this subsequent proceeding  
15 that he served as lookout during the murders and entered the residence only afterwards to assist  
16 Petitioner and Joey. (SResp. Ex. A., p. 3:1-11.)

17 Petitioner is also correct in noting that, while Dr. Holloway testified at the preliminary  
18 hearing that the same type of implement inflicted consistent scalp wounds on both Mr.  
19 Bocanegra and Mrs. Bocanegra, (CT 118-119), Holloway at the penalty phase stated that Mr.  
20 Bocanegra's scalp wounds were only "partially", rather than "entirely" consistent with Mrs.  
21 Bocanegra's scalp wounds; and that it appeared different objects were used to inflict these scalp  
22 wounds. (RT 2712-13, 2720-21, 2725.) However, Holloway qualified his preliminary hearing  
23 testimony by noting that the scalp wounds on Mr. Bocanegra and Mrs. Bocanegra were not  
24 necessarily inflicted by the same instrument. (CT 131-134.)

25 Holloway's testimony, as qualified, did not then preclude the possibility that more than  
26 one weapon and more than one perpetrator inflicted the wounds. Defense counsel Toton argued  
27 as much, that different individuals, using different weapons, could have inflicted the scalp  
28

1 wounds on Mr. Bocanegra and Mrs. Bocanegra. (RT 189-191.)

2 The Court finds that, for the reasons discussed in claims 1-9, the state court could  
3 reasonably have found that there was sufficient evidence to convict Petitioner of aiding and  
4 abetting first degree murder based upon a finding of premeditation and deliberation. In the face  
5 of such substantial evidence, a further showing regarding physical evidence, that Reyes left a  
6 bloody shoe print, and that two different weapons may have inflicted the scalp wounds, would  
7 not have raised a reasonable doubt that Petitioner aided and abetted the premeditated and  
8 deliberate murders of Mr. Bocanegra and Mrs. Bocanegra. Additionally, evidence of Petitioner's  
9 shoepoint in the kitchen undermines Seeley's testimony that Petitioner watched the assault on  
10 Mr. Bocanegra from the hallway. (SHCP, Ex. 419, pp. 6, 7, 22-23.)

11 For the reasons stated, Petitioner has not made an evidentiary showing of prejudice, i.e.,  
12 that there is a reasonable probability of a different outcome from investigating physical evidence  
13 of the Bocanegra murder scene. As noted, such a defense was contrary to Petitioner's stated  
14 desire to plead guilty to the Bocanegra murders (SPet. Ex. 520, p.2) and "dying for his crimes  
15 but dying with a clear conscience." (SPet. Ex. 700.) Petitioner waived jury trial and submitted  
16 guilt and special circumstances phase on the preliminary hearing transcript and the testimony of  
17 additional prosecution witnesses. See Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 23-30.

18 Accordingly, the Court is not convinced of a reasonable probability that supplemental  
19 crime scene evidence would have prompted defense counsel to put on a further defense or would  
20 have resulted in a more favorable disposition for Petitioner given his incriminating statements to  
21 detective Stratton and reporter Trihey and the crime scene evidence corroborated by Hernandez's  
22 testimony. (See discussion of claims 1-9, *ante*.)

23 For the reasons stated, a fair-minded jurist could have found that Petitioner failed to  
24 establish that defense counsel's performance fell below an objective standard of reasonableness  
25 and that, but for counsel's unprofessional errors, the result of the proceeding would have been  
26 different. Strickland, 466 U.S., at 687-694.

27 It does not appear that the state court rejection of the claim was contrary to, or an  
28

1 unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law, as determined by the Supreme  
2 Court, or that the state court's ruling was based on an unreasonable determination of the facts in  
3 light of the evidence presented in the state court proceeding. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

4       Claim 10 is denied.

5       **g.       Review of Claim 11**

6       Petitioner next claims ineffective assistance of counsel by failure to pursue plea  
7 negotiations, violating his Sixth, Eighth and Fourteenth Amendment rights.

8       The California Supreme Court summarily denied this claim (SPet. Claim H) raised in  
9 Petitioner's state petition for habeas corpus. In re Sanchez, S049502 (DD). As noted, in such a  
10 case "the habeas petitioner's burden still must be met by showing there was no reasonable basis  
11 for the state court to deny relief," Richter, 562 U.S. at 98, and this Court "must determine what  
12 arguments or theories supported or . . . *could have supported*, the state court's decision; and then  
13 it must ask whether it is possible fair-minded jurists could disagree that those arguments or  
14 theories are inconsistent with the holding in a prior decision of this Court." Id. (emphasis  
15 added).

16       Petitioner alleges that defense counsel was deficient in failing to pursue plea negotiations  
17 given that the evidence supported the prosecution's theory that Joey was the actual killer of his  
18 parents. (RT 122, 155-156.) Petitioner points out that Reyes, whom the prosecution viewed to  
19 be of equal culpability, consummated a plea deal in his separate proceeding and avoided the  
20 death penalty. (Id.)

21       This claim fails. The state court could reasonably have found defense counsel Toton was  
22 not deficient in failing to pursue continuing plea negotiations. The record reflects that Toton  
23 attempted to obtain a plea deal for Petitioner on May 10, 1988. But the prosecutor rejected the  
24 plea deal when Petitioner refused to provide information of Joey's involvement in the Bocanegra  
25 murders, even though Petitioner had proposed to do just that in his plea bid. (SResp. Ex. B.)

26       Toton also made a pre-penalty phase overture for Petitioner to provide information  
27 regarding Joey's involvement in the Bocanegra murders in return for life without parole. Here  
28

1 again, Petitioner ultimately refused to provide such information, ending any possible deal. Id.

2 Nothing reasonably suggests that persistence of counsel alone could have resulted in a  
3 plea deal without Petitioner's cooperation.

4 Prosecutor Ryals, who prosecuted both Petitioner and, in a separate proceeding, Reyes,  
5 based her "decisions regarding plea bargain agreements . . . on [her] evaluations of the evidence,  
6 the facts, and the circumstances of each case" and that "[t]he persistence and/or insistence of  
7 defense counsel in seeking a plea bargain agreement on behalf of their client [was] not a factor . .  
8 . ." (Id.) The Court notes that "[s]trict adherence to the Strickland standard" is "all the more  
9 essential when reviewing the choices an attorney made at the plea bargain stage." Premo, 562  
10 U.S. at 124. "Plea bargains are the result of complex negotiations suffused with uncertainty, and  
11 defense attorneys must make careful strategic choices in balancing opportunities and risks." Id.

12 Additionally, for the reasons discussed in claims 1 through 4, *ante*, the evidence against  
13 Petitioner was substantial. In the face of such evidence and Petitioner's failure to support his  
14 negotiated plea offers, it is not reasonably probable that continuing attempts by defense counsel  
15 toward a negotiated plea would have been successful. See Burger v. Kemp, 483 U.S. 776, 785-  
16 86 (1987) (no ineffective assistance claim where prosecutor refuses to engage in plea  
17 bargaining).

18 Petitioner has not made an evidentiary showing of prejudice given the improbability of a  
19 plea deal without his cooperation. Petitioner expressly stated his desire to plead guilty to the  
20 Bocanegra murders (SPet. Ex. 520, p. 2) and "dying for his crimes but dying with a clear  
21 conscience." (SPet. Ex. 700; see Jones, 114 F.3d at 1012 (denying factual development where  
22 improbable petitioner would have accepted plea offer). As noted, Petitioner waived jury trial and  
23 submitted the guilt and special circumstances phase on the preliminary hearing transcript and the  
24 testimony of additional prosecution witnesses. See Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 23-30. The evidence  
25 does not suggest a reasonable probability that further plea negotiation would have resulted in a  
26 more favorable disposition for Petitioner given his incriminating statements to detective Stratton  
27 and reporter Trihey and the crime scene evidence corroborated by Hernandez's testimony.

1 For the reasons stated, a fair-minded jurist could have found that Petitioner failed to  
2 establish that defense counsel's performance fell below an objective standard of reasonableness  
3 and that, but for counsel's unprofessional errors, the result of the proceeding would have been  
4 different. Strickland, 466 U.S., at 687-694.

5 It does not appear that the state court rejection of the claim was contrary to, or an  
6 unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law, as determined by the Supreme  
7 Court, or that the state court's ruling was based on an unreasonable determination of the facts in  
8 light of the evidence presented in the state court proceeding. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

9 Claim 11 is denied.

10 **h. Review of Claim 12**

11 Petitioner claims ineffective assistance of counsel by counsel's failure to move to exclude  
12 jailhouse statements by Petitioner to the police implicating him in the Bocanegra homicides,  
13 violating his Fifth, Sixth, Eighth and Fourteenth Amendment rights.

14 The California Supreme Court summarily denied this claim (SPet. Claim I) raised in  
15 Petitioner's state petition for habeas corpus. In re Sanchez, S049502 (DD). As noted, in such a  
16 case "the habeas petitioner's burden still must be met by showing there was no reasonable basis  
17 for the state court to deny relief," Richter, 562 U.S. at 98, and this Court "must determine what  
18 arguments or theories supported or . . . could have supported, the state court's decision; and then  
19 it must ask whether it is possible fair-minded jurists could disagree that those arguments or  
20 theories are inconsistent with the holding in a prior decision of this Court." Id. (emphasis  
21 added).

22 Petitioner supports this claim with facts alleged in claim 6, *ante*. He alleges that he  
23 suffered organic brain damage, psychiatric disorders (post-traumatic stress disorder, depression,  
24 and paranoia), and that he expected favorable treatment when, at the request of his then attorney,  
25 Mr. Huffman, Petitioner waived Miranda rights and gave incriminating statements to detective  
26 Stratton, (CT 75-78) (Bocanegra murders), and detective Boggs (CT 308-319) (Tatman  
27 murder). Petitioner claims that his Miranda waiver was not intelligent and voluntary.

1       In Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436, 444 (1966), the Supreme Court held that “the  
2 prosecution may not use statements, whether exculpatory or inculpatory, stemming from  
3 custodial interrogation of the defendant unless it demonstrates the use of procedural safeguards  
4 effective to secure the privilege against self-incrimination.” As to the procedural safeguards to  
5 be employed, “[p]rior to any questioning, the person must be warned that he has a right to remain  
6 silent, that any statement he does make may be used as evidence against him, and that he has a  
7 right to the presence of an attorney, either retained or appointed.” Id. Nevertheless, “[t]he  
8 defendant may waive effectuation’ of the rights conveyed in the warnings ‘provided the waiver is  
9 made voluntarily, knowingly and intelligently.’” Moran v. Burbine, 475 U.S. 412, 421 (1986)  
10 (quoting Miranda, 384 U.S. at 444, 475).

11       This claim fails for the same reasons discussed in claim 6. The state court could  
12 reasonably have found that the evidence did not show that prior to, during, or after the murders  
13 Petitioner suffered any material neurological and/or psychiatric impairment. The report of court-  
14 appointed psychiatrist Matychowiak states that on November 13, 1987, [Petitioner] was “able to  
15 discuss himself, his decisions and his reasoning for his decisions” and was “presently able to  
16 understand the nature and purpose of the proceedings taken against him” and “to cooperate in a  
17 rational manner with counsel in presenting a defense.” (SPet. Ex. 520, pp.5-6.)

18       Under Miranda, if a suspect indicates “at any time prior to or *during* questioning, that he  
19 wishes to remain silent, the interrogation must cease.” Miranda, 384 U.S. at 473-74 (emphasis  
20 added). Petitioner does not point to evidence supporting coercive tactics by Stratton and Boggs  
21 or showing Petitioner was promised any concession in his then pending charge of burglarizing  
22 Joey’s residence. See Colorado v. Connelly, 479 U.S. 157, 167 (1986) (confession not  
23 involuntary absent coercive police activity). Petitioner apparently did not attempt to make any  
24 evidentiary showing of police coercion. The state court could have reasonably concluded  
25 Petitioner’s Miranda waiver was not involuntary.

26       Additionally, it was Petitioner who initiated contact with the police, offering testimony  
27 on the Bocanegra murders in exchange for “some type of consideration” in the burglary charge  
28

1 against him. (SPet. Ex. 412; CT 76.)

2 The Court finds that, in the face of such lack of evidence, it is not reasonably probable  
3 that a motion to exclude jailhouse statements based upon invalid waiver would have been  
4 successful. See Kimmelman v. Morrison, 477 U.S. 365, 381 (1986) (counsel's failure to make a  
5 futile motion is not ineffective assistance). Even assuming impaired mental status, such alone is  
6 not sufficient reason to suppress a confession. See Connelly, 479 U.S. at 167 (coercive police  
7 conduct necessary to find confession involuntary under Due Process Clause).

8 Petitioner has not made an evidentiary showing of prejudice, that there is a reasonable  
9 probability of a different outcome had defense counsel moved to exclude jailhouse statements  
10 based on invalid waiver. As discussed, such a defense was contrary to Petitioner's stated desire  
11 to plead guilty to the Bocanegra murders (SPet. Ex. 520, p.2) and "dying for his crimes but dying  
12 with a clear conscience." (SPet. Ex. 700.) Petitioner waived jury trial and submitted the guilt  
13 and special circumstances phase on the preliminary hearing transcript and the testimony of  
14 additional prosecution witnesses. See Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 23-30. The evidence does not  
15 suggest a reasonable probability that a motion to exclude jailhouse statements would have  
16 resulted in a more favorable disposition for Petitioner given his incriminating statements to  
17 reporter Trihey and the crime scene evidence corroborated by Hernandez's testimony. (See  
18 claims 1-4, *ante*.)

19 For the reasons stated, a fair-minded jurist could have found that Petitioner failed to  
20 establish that defense counsel's performance fell below an objective standard of reasonableness  
21 and that, but for counsel's unprofessional errors, the result of the proceeding would have been  
22 different. Strickland, 466 U.S., at 687-694.

23 It does not appear that the state court rejection of the claim was contrary to, or an  
24 unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law, as determined by the Supreme  
25 Court, or that the state court's ruling was based on an unreasonable determination of the facts in  
26 light of the evidence presented in the state court proceeding. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

27 Claim 12 is denied.

28

1                   **i.       Review of Claim 13**

2           In this next claim, Petitioner alleges ineffective assistance of counsel by failure to seek  
3 sufficient continuance to adequately prepare for trial, violating his Sixth, Eighth and Fourteenth  
4 Amendment rights.

5           The California Supreme Court summarily denied this claim (SPet. Claim J) raised in  
6 Petitioner's state petition for habeas corpus. In re Sanchez, S049502 (DD.) As noted, in such a  
7 case "the habeas petitioner's burden still must be met by showing there was no reasonable basis  
8 for the state court to deny relief," Richter, 562 U.S. at 98, and this Court "must determine what  
9 arguments or theories supported or . . . *could have supported*, the state court's decision; and then  
10 it must ask whether it is possible fair-minded jurists could disagree that those arguments or  
11 theories are inconsistent with the holding in a prior decision of this Court." Id. (emphasis  
12 added).

13           Petitioner supports this claim with facts alleged in claims 2, 4, and 6 through 10. He  
14 alleges that, as of May 16, 1988, when a three-week pre-trail continuance was requested and  
15 granted through June 27, 1988, defense counsel had done no guilt investigation, except for  
16 consulting a serologist and obtaining a sanity evaluation, (SHCP, Ex. 127, ¶ 4), and had not done  
17 any investigation for the penalty phase. (SHCP, Ex. 127, ¶¶ 4, 11.) He claims competent  
18 counsel would have begun trial preparations sooner. (Id., ¶ 12.)

19           Petitioner's trial began on July 7, 1988. He alleges that had defense counsel requested,  
20 consistent with local practice, required a continuance longer than the three weeks, there is a  
21 reasonable probability that a plea bargain could have been negotiated, or a full trial on guilt and  
22 special circumstances would have been sought.

23           For the reasons discussed in claims 1-12, the evidence does not support a reasonable  
24 possibility that Petitioner would have received a more favorable disposition even with a longer  
25 continuance. Petitioner relies on defense investigator Peninger's declaration regarding the extent  
26 to which she was aware of the defense investigation and her view that further investigation  
27 should have been done. (SPet. Ex. 127, pp. 1-2.) Even if evidence, the Peninger declaration  
28

1 does not demonstrate the actual extent and tactical appropriateness of defense counsel's trial  
2 preparations.

3 The record suggests that defense counsel timely began trial preparations, retaining  
4 defense expert(s) as early as November 1987. (RT [5/16/88] 3-4.) Petitioner concedes defense  
5 counsel retained serology and psychological experts prior to the request for continuance. The  
6 continuance request was partially opposed by the prosecution, (RT [5/16/88] 5-6; CT 713-714),  
7 suggesting a further continuance was unlikely.

8 There state court could reasonably have determined that Petitioner did not want or need a  
9 continuance. Petitioner initially refused to waive time for beginning trial, stating his intention to  
10 enter a guilty plea. (RT [5/16/88] 7.) Petitioner agreed to waive time only after discussions with  
11 counsel. (RT [5/16/88] 7-8.) Petitioner continued to express his desire to plead guilty to the  
12 Bocanegra murders. (SPet. Exhs. 520, p.2; 700.)

13 On July 11, 1988, Toton requested submission of guilt and special circumstance phase  
14 on the preliminary hearing transcript. Defense counsel Frank had no expressed need for a further  
15 continuance to prepare his penalty phase case. Frank stated his preparations would be complete  
16 by July 25, 1988. (RT [5/16/88] 6.) The penalty phase did not start until September 21, 1988,  
17 almost two month later. (CT 949; RT 2583.) It does not reasonably appear the defense needed  
18 and would have been granted further pre-trial continuance. "A fair assessment of attorney  
19 performance requires that every effort be made to eliminate the distorting effects of hindsight . . .  
20 and to evaluate the conduct from counsel's perspective at the time." Strickland, 466 U.S. at 689.

21 For the reasons stated, a fair-minded jurist could have reasonably have determined that,  
22 based on the evidence, a longer continuance would not have resulted in a more favorable  
23 disposition for Petitioner. His incriminating statements to detective Stratton and reporter Trihey  
24 and the crime scene evidence that was corroborated by Hernandez's testimony reasonably  
25 suggest otherwise. (See claims 1-12, *ante*.)

26 Petitioner has failed to establish that defense counsel's performance fell below an  
27 objective standard of reasonableness and that, but for counsel's unprofessional errors, the result  
28

1 of the proceeding would have been different. Strickland, 466 U.S., at 687-694.

2 It does not appear that the state court rejection of the claim was contrary to, or an  
3 unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law, as determined by the Supreme  
4 Court, or that the state court's ruling was based on an unreasonable determination of the facts in  
5 light of the evidence presented in the state court proceeding. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

6 Claim 13 is denied.

7 **j. Review of Claim 14**

8 Petitioner next claims ineffective assistance of counsel by the decision to waive jury trial,  
9 confrontation and presentation of a defense, violating his Fifth, Sixth, Eighth and Fourteenth  
10 Amendment rights.

11 The California Supreme Court summarily denied this claim (SPet. Claim K) raised in  
12 Petitioner's state petition for habeas corpus. In re Sanchez, S049502 (DD.)

13 The state supreme court, on direct appeal, addressed the merits of the validity of  
14 submission on the Preliminary Hearing Transcript as follow:

15 [Petitioner's] chief guilt phase trial counsel, Toton, informed the court that the  
16 submission proposal was a compromise made by defendant at Toton's request.  
17 Defendant originally had wanted to plead guilty to the capital charges, but Toton  
18 would not consent to such a plea, believing that a guilty plea would amount to  
19 ineffective assistance of counsel . . . . [Citation]

20 Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 24.

21 Defendant repeatedly acknowledged that he was waiving his constitutional rights and that  
22 his decision was entered "freely and voluntarily." Id., at 25. Once the waivers were taken, the  
23 following exchange occurred between the trial court and Petitioner:

24 "The Court: I take it that . . . Mr. Frank and Mr. Toton have talked to you at some  
length about the waivers?

25 "The Defendant: Yes, sir.

26 "The Court: Do you feel you understood them?

27 "The Defendant: Yes, sir, I believe I do.

28 "The Court: And you have had some time to think about it, at least since about  
10:30 this morning, and they talked to you later, I take it?

"The Defendant: Yes, sir.

"The Court: And you have thought about it?

1       “The Defendant: Yes, sir.

2       “The Court: So far as you are losing your right to confront witnesses, those  
3       witnesses whose testimony will be presented to the court through the preliminary  
4       examination, you won't get a chance to cross-examine them in this court. You  
5       understand that?

6       “Defendant: Yes sir.

7       “The Court: And you are giving that right up then?

8       “The Defendant: Yes, sir.

9       “The Court: Now, so far as the witnesses called . . . to augment the People's case  
10      and/or in your behalf, the live witnesses called in this case, you will have the right  
11      to confrontation and you understand that?

12      “Defendant: Yes, sir.

13      “The Court: I have to tell you that some of the cases in the state of California say  
14      that when you present a case to the judge to determine the guilt or innocence on  
15      the basis of the preliminary hearing transcript, that's sometimes called a slow  
16      guilty plea.

17      “Defendant: Yes, sir.

18      “The Court: I don't know whether you have heard that language before, but it's  
19      used in the cases.

20      “Defendant: Yes, sir.

21      “The Court: And I want you to be aware of that. I am not telling you how I am  
22      going to decide this case, but there is an aura of that in the cases and you should  
23      be aware of that fact.

24      “Defendant: Yes, sir.

25      “The Court: And do you understand that?

26      “The Defendant: Yes, sir.

27      “The Court: And you are willing to give up your right to a trial by jury both as to  
28      the guilt of the two homicides alleged and of the other enhancements and the  
29      special circumstances; is that right?

30      “Defendant: Yes.

31      “The Court: And you know you have the right, and we are ready to give you a  
32      jury on all those issues.

33      “Defendant: Yes, your Honor, I understand all that.

34      “The Court: And you nonetheless give it up?

35      “Defendant: Yes, sir.”

36      19      *Id.*, at 25-26.

37      20      The trial court later confirmed the waivers:

38      21      “The Court: Are you satisfied with your decision?

39      22      “Defendant: Yes, sir, I am very confident.

40      23      “The Court: Because you know we have got a record of everything here. It's going  
41      to be kind of hard to tell somebody else, gee, I didn't think about it. The judge  
42      coerced me. The [d]istrict [a]ttorney growled at me. My lawyers kicked me  
43      around. You know, it's going to be kind of hard to say that after you have been  
44      very candid with us here. Are you satisfied with that?

45      “Defendant: Yes, sir, I am very satisfied.

46      “The Court: You seem satisfied. I believe you are satisfied. I will make that kind  
47      of a finding.”

1 Id., at 27.

2 Petitioner confirmed his intent to waive his jury trial and confrontation rights the  
3 following morning, but no mention was made by the court or counsel of defendant's right against  
4 self-incrimination. Even so, the California Supreme Court went on to find Petitioner's  
5 submission on the preliminary hearing transcripts was not a "slow (guilty) plea" that would have  
6 required an on the record waiver of the right against self-incrimination, as follows:

7  
8 Defense counsel Toton conducted substantial cross-examination of the  
9 prosecution witnesses during the preliminary hearing. Toton also called  
10 prosecution witnesses Hernandez and Detective Stratton to testify for the defense,  
11 and questioned Hernandez about whether he had agreed to testify against  
12 defendant with the intent of making a deal in his own case.

13 In addition, following the close of the prosecution's guilt phase presentation,  
14 Toton renewed his motions to strike portions of the trial testimony of Maria  
15 Rodriguez, Detective Boggs, and William Freeman (the patrolman who seized  
16 two screwdrivers from defendant that had been stolen from the Bocanegra  
17 residence), and then moved for a judgment of acquittal of all the charges.

18 In arguing the motion for acquittal, Toton asserted there was insufficient evidence  
19 of defendant's guilt of the robbery and murder charges, and that the People failed  
20 to charge properly the special circumstance allegations. In addition, Toton  
21 asserted that no physical evidence linked defendant to the Bocanegra murders. He  
22 argued that the prosecution presented no evidence of premeditation in those  
23 murders, and that defendant's hypothetical questions to Detective Stratton should  
24 not be used as evidence of murder. Toton also pointed out that defendant's  
25 incriminating statements to newsman Trihey implied knowledge of the crime, but  
26 not intent to kill, that there was no evidence that defendant robbed the Bocanegras  
or that defendant had the specific intent to kill either the Bocanegras or Tatman.

27 Toton's closing argument following the guilt phase was equally extensive. He  
28 asserted there was insufficient evidence, as a matter of law, to prove beyond a  
reasonable doubt that defendant committed the charged robberies and the  
Bocanegra murders because the testimony of Hernandez and Trihey was not  
credible. At best, he argued, the evidence in the Bocanegra murders supported a  
verdict of voluntary manslaughter. He also asserted that the prosecution had failed  
to prove the specific intent to kill necessary to support the special circumstance  
allegations.

29 It therefore appears that defense counsel's cross-examination was substantial, and  
30 that he argued constantly that the facts as presented at the preliminary hearing  
31 should be viewed as not supporting first degree murder convictions. These facts  
32 support the People's assertion that defendant's submission on the preliminary  
33 hearing transcripts for the guilt and special circumstance phases of the trial was  
34 not tantamount to a guilty plea. [Citation]

35 For submissions not tantamount to a guilty plea, a trial court's failure to advise the  
36 defendant of his right against self-incrimination is implicated only to the extent

1 defendant surrendered the right. [Citation] Through the submission stipulated to  
2 here, defendant never surrendered his self-incrimination privilege because he  
3 chose not to testify during the guilt phase proceedings. Because defendant never  
4 surrendered his right against self-incrimination, there was no requirement of a  
5 personal, on-the-record waiver. [Citation]

6 Id., at 29-30.

7 The state supreme court also concluded there was no requirement that Petitioner be  
8 advised of ramifications of submission and waiver and the probability of conviction in light of  
9 defendant's reservation of his right to present additional evidence and to contest his alleged guilt  
10 in argument to the court. That is, a defendant must be advised of the probability that his  
11 submission will result in a conviction of the offenses only “[i]f a defendant does not reserve the  
right to present additional evidence and does not advise the court that he will contest his guilt in  
argument to the court . . . .” Bunnell, 13 Cal.3d 592, 605 (1975).

12 Petitioner contends that reasonably competent counsel defending a capital case would not  
13 have submitted without a full trial. He supports this claim with facts alleged in claims 2, 4 and 6  
14 through 10. He reiterates his above claims that Toton and Frank did not conduct sufficient trial  
15 investigation and preparation. He claims Toton's agreement to allow additional evidence upon  
16 submission negated Toton's theory that submission on the preliminary hearing would limit  
17 damaging evidence. (See SHCP Ex. 137, ¶¶ 14-16.) He claims that Frank had reservations  
18 about waiving full defense, but did not express them to the trial court. (SHCP Ex. 113, ¶¶ 13-  
19.) However, this Court finds that, for the reasons and based on the evidence discussed in  
20 claims 1-13, *ante*, the state court could reasonably have found that defense counsel were not  
21 deficient in preparing for trial and that the trial waiver was not necessarily informed on this basis..

22 Petitioner alleges mental impairments prevented him from knowingly, voluntarily, and  
23 intelligently entering the waiver with complete knowledge of the relevant circumstances and  
24 likely consequences. See Brady v. United States, 397 U.S. 742, 747-48 and n.4 (1970).  
25 However, the mental defense claim is unavailing for reasons discussed in claim 6. Petitioner  
26 agreed to submit the case following “several long discussions” with Toton, (SPet. Ex. 137, p.5)  
27 and in compromise of Petitioner's expressed desire to plead guilty (RT [5/16/88] 7), and Toton's

1 refusal to consent to a guilty plea. The trial judge discussed the submission with Petitioner in  
2 some detail, including how it might impact his case (CT 889, 891-892; RT – 65a-71a, 85a-89a,  
3 98a-115a.) and the waiver of any conflict of interest Toton might have had relating to his  
4 debarment proceedings. (RT [7/27/88] 6.) Petitioner waived his trial rights on the record. (RT  
5 107a-111a.) The prosecution also examined him regarding the waivers. (RT 108a-114a.) It was  
6 not unreasonable for the state court to conclude that Petitioner understood and freely entered the  
7 waivers.

8 Petitioner also fails to make an evidentiary showing of prejudice. He had expressed his  
9 intention to enter a guilty plea (RT [5/16/88] 7) and waive jury trial. (RT [7/27/88] 6.) Defense  
10 counsel Frank's preparation of penalty phase defense was nearly complete at time of the trial  
11 waiver and was not adversely affected. (SPet. Ex. 113, pp. 5-7.) Defense counsel could have  
12 reasonably believed that, as a matter of trial strategy, submission on the preliminary hearing  
13 transcripts would limit damaging evidence, (SPet. Exhs. 137, pp. 4-5; 113, pp.4-5), keeping  
14 "some of the blood and gore of the homicides away from the penalty jury." (SPet. Ex. 113, ¶ 16.)  
15 Especially so given Toton's concern that Reyes might testify against Petitioner, and Toton's  
16 belief the aider and abettor theory might be more favorably decided by the court rather than a  
17 jury. (SPet. Ex. 137, p. 5.)

18 In sum, the evidentiary record does not support a reasonable possibility that Petitioner  
19 would have received a more favorable disposition had the matter gone to jury trial at the guilt  
20 and special circumstance phase. Had Petitioner testified before a jury as to lack of knowledge  
21 and intent in aiding and abetting the murders, he likely would have been impeached for reasons  
22 discussed in claims 1-13.

23 For the reasons stated, Petitioner has not established that defense counsel's performance  
24 fell below an objective standard of reasonableness and that, but for counsel's unprofessional  
25 errors, the result of the proceeding would have been different. Strickland, 466 U.S., at 687-694.

26 It does not appear that the state court rejection of the claim was contrary to, or an  
27 unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law, as determined by the Supreme  
28

1 Court, or that the state court's ruling was based on an unreasonable determination of the facts in  
2 light of the evidence presented in the state court proceeding. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

3 Claim 14 is denied.

4 **k. Review of Claim 15**

5 Petitioner next claims ineffective assistance of counsel by failing to cross-examine  
6 newspaper report Trihey, violating Petitioner's Fifth, Sixth, Eighth and Fourteenth Amendment  
7 rights.

8 The California Supreme Court summarily denied this claim (SPet. Claim L) as it was  
9 raised in Petitioner's state petition for habeas corpus. In re Sanchez, S049502 (DD.) That court  
10 also rejected on appeal Petitioner's contention that Toton's failure to cross-examine Trihey  
11 before closing argument denied him the effective assistance of counsel, finding that:

12 Toton convinced the court during his closing argument that Trihey's testimony  
13 should not be given substantial weight; his decision not to cross-examine Trihey  
14 as to the contents of the published material was sound strategy, given the nature  
15 of defendant's alleged contradictory statements. Defendant does not establish that  
16 cross-examination would have revealed any new information, or that any  
17 additional information about the interviews would have influenced the court's  
18 judgment. Hence, we cannot find counsel's failure to cross-examination Trihey to  
19 be deficient. In any event, given the fact that the court dismissed the robbery  
20 charges against defendant, and found not true the robbery-murder special-  
21 circumstance allegation, we discern no prejudice to defendant based on counsel's  
22 performance. [Citation]

23 Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th 59.

24 Petitioner supports this claim with facts alleged in claims 2 and 4. He alleges that had  
25 Toton cross-examined Trihey on the published newspaper articles he could have called into  
26 question the version of events offered by Trihey and Hernandez, and supported Petitioner's  
27 mental defenses. (Pet. ¶ 306-314.)

28 Strickland provides that "strategic choices made after thorough investigation of law and  
29 facts relevant to plausible options are virtually unchallengeable." Strickland, 466 U.S. at 690-91.  
30 "[S]trategic choices made after less than complete investigation are reasonable precisely to the  
31 extent that reasonable professional judgments support the limitations on investigation." Id.

1 Petitioner argues cross-examination regarding the contents of the newspaper articles,  
2 cross-examination Toton refused under conditions imposed by the Court (limiting such to the  
3 printed articles – see RT 57-59) would have been beneficial, but he does not demonstrate how or  
4 why this is so given his contradictory statements of the crimes and his involvement.

5 Trihey testified at the guilt and special circumstance phase that during the course of five  
6 interviews, Petitioner stated he was “a triple murderer” and that the victims were killed for their  
7 “Social Security checks.” (RT 17-18). These statements were included in the published articles.  
8 (Id.) Based on the record before it, the state court could reasonably have found that any claimed  
9 advantage that would have resulted from cross-examination of Trihey was speculative. It  
10 follows that the decision of defense counsel not to cross-examine Trihey could be seen as neither  
11 unreasonable nor prejudicial.

12 The trial judge limited any cross-examination to the confession and information  
13 published by Trihey in the newspaper. Unable to impeach Trihey, defense counsel could  
14 reasonably have concluded that cross-examination might highlight inconsistencies in Petitioner’s  
15 versions of how the murders occurred, bolstering both the direct examination and the damaging  
16 testimony of Hernandez. Moreover, defense counsel Toton, during closing argument, argued  
17 effectively to limit the impact of Trihey’s testimony regarding robbery, (RT 175-183), and the  
18 robbery-murder special circumstance. Petitioner cannot show prejudice where he fails to state  
19 with specificity the nature of the proposed testimony. Alcala v. Woodford, 334 F.3d 862, 872-73  
20 (9th Cir. 2003); see also Bragg v. Galaza, 242 F.3d 1082, 1088 (9th Cir. 2001) (mere speculation  
21 of possible helpful information from potential witnesses is not sufficient to show ineffective  
22 assistance of counsel).

23 Additionally, for the reasons discussed in claims 1 through 4 and 6, the evidence does not  
24 support a reasonable possibility that Petitioner would have received a more favorable disposition  
25 on sufficiency of the evidence, actual innocence and mental states defenses by cross-examining  
26 Trihey. Instead, defense counsel could have reasonably believed that cross-examining Trihey as  
27 to mental state defenses, unsupported in the record, might serve only to reinforce the published  
28

1 confession.

2 Petitioner was not prejudiced by failing to Toton's failure to cross-examine Trihey. The  
3 trial court's guilt phase verdicts, rejecting robbery and robbery special circumstance counts in the  
4 Bocanegra homicides, reflect its acceptance of Toton's argument that Trihey's testimony should  
5 not be given substantial weight. (RT 235-236.) Trihey's testimony likely would not have  
6 changed the outcome.

7 Accordingly, the Court finds the state court rejection of the claim was neither contrary to,  
8 or an unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law, as determined by the Supreme  
9 Court, nor based on an unreasonable determination of the facts in light of the evidence presented  
10 in the state court proceeding, viewed most favoring the prosecution. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

11 Claim 15 is denied.

12 **I. Review of Claim 16**

13 In his next claim, Petitioner alleges ineffective assistance of counsel by failure to argue  
14 for second degree Murder in Bocanegra homicides, violating his Fifth, Sixth, Eighth and  
15 Fourteenth Amendment rights.

16 The California Supreme Court summarily denied this claim (SPet. Claim M) raised in  
17 Petitioner's state petition for habeas corpus. In re Sanchez, S049502 (DD). As noted, in such a  
18 case "the habeas petitioner's burden still must be met by showing there was no reasonable basis  
19 for the state court to deny relief," Richter, 562 U.S. at 98, and this Court "must determine what  
20 arguments or theories supported or . . . could have supported, the state court's decision; and then  
21 it must ask whether it is possible fair-minded jurists could disagree that those arguments or  
22 theories are inconsistent with the holding in a prior decision of this Court." Id. (emphasis  
23 added).

24 Petitioner claims that Toton should have argued for lesser included second degree murder  
25 because evidence he premeditated the murders was insufficient. (RT 168-196.) He supports this  
26 claim with facts alleged in claims 2 and 4, *ante*. However, Petitioner has not established actual  
27 innocence, or that the evidence was insufficient to support the premeditated and deliberate

1 murder of the Bocanegras. (See claims 1 through 4, *ante*.) Second degree murder was in any  
2 event a lesser included option, necessarily rejected by the trial court in its finding of first degree  
3 murder. (RT 235-236.)

4 The Court finds it was not unreasonable for Toton to argue voluntary manslaughter (RT  
5 168-196), foregoing argument of second degree murder, given his theory that a sudden heated  
6 argument between Mr. Bocanegra and Joey led to the killings. (CT 77-78, 479, 487, 500, 590;  
7 RT 97, 132-33, 188-193, 195-96.) Given the support in the evidentiary record for the  
8 manslaughter argument, the state court could reasonably have determined Toton's failure to  
9 argue for second degree murder was not ineffective assistance.

10 The state court could reasonably have determined that Petitioner was not prejudiced by  
11 Toton's failure to argue for second degree murder. Though Petitioner contends in this claim that  
12 he was willing to accept any non-capital conviction, this position is not consistent with his stated  
13 desire to plead guilty to the Bocanegra murders. (SPet. Ex. 520, p. 2; 700.) Petitioner waived  
14 jury trial and submitted guilt and special circumstances phase on the preliminary hearing  
15 transcript and the testimony of additional prosecution witnesses. See Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 23-  
16 30. The evidence does not suggest a reasonable probability that argument for second degree  
17 murder would have resulted in a more favorable disposition for Petitioner given the substantial  
18 evidence against him, his incriminating statements to detective Stratton and reporter Trihey and  
19 the crime scene evidence corroborated by Hernandez's testimony. (See claims 1-10.)

20 The Court notes that Toton's motion for acquittal based upon sufficiency of the evidence  
21 was denied by the trial court. (RT 140-141.) Toton's argument in closing, revisiting  
22 insufficiency of the evidence, was also unsuccessful.

23 Accordingly, a fair-minded jurist could have found that Petitioner failed to establish that  
24 defense counsel's performance fell below an objective standard of reasonableness and that, but  
25 for counsel's unprofessional errors, the result of the proceeding would have been different.  
26 Strickland, 466 U.S., at 687-694.

27 It does not appear that the state court rejection of the claim was contrary to, or an  
28

1 unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law, as determined by the Supreme  
2 Court, or that the state court's ruling was based on an unreasonable determination of the facts in  
3 light of the evidence presented in the state court proceeding. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

4       Claim 16 is denied.

5       **m.     Review of Claim 17**

6       Petitioner next claims ineffective assistance of counsel by failure to object to improper  
7 prosecution closing at the guilt and special circumstances phase, violating his Fifth, Sixth, Eighth  
8 and Fourteenth Amendment rights.

9       The California Supreme Court summarily denied this claim (SPet. Claim N) raised in  
10 Petitioner's state petition for habeas corpus. In re Sanchez, S049502 (DD.) As noted, in such a  
11 case "the habeas petitioner's burden still must be met by showing there was no reasonable basis  
12 for the state court to deny relief," Richter, 562 U.S. at 98, and this Court "must determine what  
13 arguments or theories supported or . . . *could have supported*, the state court's decision; and then  
14 it must ask whether it is possible fair-minded jurists could disagree that those arguments or  
15 theories are inconsistent with the holding in a prior decision of this Court." Id. (emphasis  
16 added).

17       Petitioner alleges that the prosecutor's argument, that there were only two people, other  
18 than the Bocanegras, present at the time of the killings, was false and misleading. Petitioner  
19 states that the prosecution presented evidence of Reyes's bloody palm print on the door knob  
20 inside the Bocanegra home. (CT 202-203.) Yet Toton failed to object because he wrongly  
21 assessed the evidence. (SHCP Ex. 137, ¶ 30.) Defense counsel Frank did not object because he  
22 was responsible only for the penalty phase. (SHCP Ex. 113, ¶ 27.)

23       This Court is not convinced. Physical evidence that Reyes was in the Bocanegra home is  
24 not inconsistent with the evidence that Reyes served as a lookout and entered the Bocanegra  
25 home after the homicides to assist Joey and Petitioner. (SResp. Ex. A, pp.3-4; see claim 10.)  
26 The prosecution's argument then was not inconsistent with the evidence. Toton could  
27 reasonably have concluded that the prosecution's "two person" argument was not objectionable

1 as false or misleading based on the record. (SPet. Ex. 137, pp. 9-10.)

2 Moreover, Petitioner did not challenge the evidence that he struck Mr. Bocanegra with a  
3 bar (CT 481-82; RT 169, 184-85, 188, 196, 207), and that he grabbed Mrs. Bocanegra and told  
4 Joey to “shut her up”. (CT 482-483, 504; RT 190-91.) Counsel is not ineffective for failing to  
5 make an objection that would be overruled. See United States v. Steele, 785 F.2d 743, 750 (9th  
6 Cir. 1986). “In any ineffectiveness case, a particular decision not to investigate must be directly  
7 assessed for reasonableness in all the circumstances, applying a heavy measure of deference to  
8 counsel's judgments.” Strickland, at 691.

9 Petitioner does not demonstrate by evidence in the record that Toton failed to reasonably  
10 investigate these matters. “[S]trategic choices made after thorough investigation of law and facts  
11 relevant to plausible options are virtually unchallengeable.” Strickland, 466 U.S. at 690-91.  
12 Even if he had, “strategic choices made after less than complete investigation are reasonable  
13 precisely to the extent that reasonable professional judgments support the limitations on  
14 investigation.” Id. Toton could reasonably have concluded further investigation would have  
15 been futile given the weight of the evidence against Petitioner.

16 Toton could have considered the prosecution argument, that there was no evidence  
17 anyone other than Joey and Petitioner committed the Bocanegra homicides, to be consistent with  
18 the evidence and not unreasonable. Moreover, Toton did argue an inference from the evidence,  
19 that Mrs. Bocanegra’s scalp wounds were inflicted by someone other than Petitioner, (RT 191),  
20 and that there was insufficient evidence to show Petitioner inflicted the wounds.

21 There is no sufficient showing that Petitioner was prejudiced by Toton’s alleged failure to  
22 object to the prosecutor’s guilt and special circumstance closing argument that there were only  
23 two perpetrators in the Bocanegra homicides. The evidentiary record contains substantial  
24 evidence against Petitioner, his incriminating statements to detective Stratton and reporter Trihey  
25 and the crime scene evidence corroborated by Hernandez’s testimony. (See claims 1-10.)

26 For the reasons stated, a fair-minded jurist could have found that Petitioner failed to  
27 establish that defense counsel’s performance fell below an objective standard of reasonableness  
28

1 and that, but for counsel's unprofessional errors, the result of the proceeding would have been  
2 different. Strickland, 466 U.S., at 687-694.

3 It does not appear that the state court rejection of the claim was contrary to, or an  
4 unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law, as determined by the Supreme  
5 Court, or that the state court's ruling was based on an unreasonable determination of the facts in  
6 light of the evidence presented in the state court proceeding. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

7 Claim 17 is denied.

8 **n. Review of Claim 18**

9 Petitioner next claims ineffective assistance of counsel by cumulative ineffectiveness  
10 during the guilt phase violating his Fifth, Sixth, Eighth and Fourteenth Amendment rights.

11 The California Supreme Court summarily denied this claim (SPet. Claim O) raised in  
12 Petitioner's state petition for habeas corpus. In re Sanchez, S049502 (DD). As noted, in such a  
13 case "the habeas petitioner's burden still must be met by showing there was no reasonable basis  
14 for the state court to deny relief," Richter, 562 U.S. at 98, and this Court "must determine what  
15 arguments or theories supported or . . . could have supported, the state court's decision; and then  
16 it must ask whether it is possible fair-minded jurists could disagree that those arguments or  
17 theories are inconsistent with the holding in a prior decision of this Court." Id. (emphasis  
18 added).

19 Petitioner claims that Toton's failure to seek a continuance to conduct guilt phase  
20 investigation, and failure to present complete defenses based on physical evidence, mental state,  
21 and testimony from Joey, Seeley, and Hernandez had the cumulative effect of denying Petitioner  
22 a full trial at the guilt and special circumstance phase and possibility of a plea bargain. Petitioner  
23 bases this claim on facts alleged in claims 2, 4, and 6 through 17, *ante*.

24 "The Supreme Court has clearly established that the combined effect of multiple trial  
25 errors may give rise to a due process violation if it renders a trial fundamentally unfair, even  
26 where each error considered individually would not require reversal." Parle v. Runnels, 505 F.3d  
27 922, 928 (9th Cir. 2007) (citing Donnelly v. DeChristoforo, 416 U.S. 637, 643 (1974)).

The cumulative effect of trial court errors can be a basis for habeas relief in certain circumstances:

Although individual errors looked at separately may not rise to the level of reversible error, their cumulative effect may nevertheless be so prejudicial as to require reversal. United States v. Necoechea, 986 F.2d 1273, 1282 (9th Cir. 1993). However, the fact that errors have been committed during a trial does not mean that reversal is required. [W]hile a defendant is entitled to a fair trial, [she] is not entitled to a perfect trial, for there are no perfect trials. United States v. Payne, 944 F.2d 1458, 1477 (9th Cir. 1991).

U.S. v. de Cruz, 82, F.3d 856, 868 (9th Cir. 1996).

Here, there is not a need to employ cumulative error analysis because review has detected no error, for the reasons discussed in claims 2, 4 and 6-17. Petitioner has not established that the evidence before the trial court showed defense counsel Toton was ineffective. These claims are insubstantial whether considered singly or cumulatively. See United States v. Karterman, 60 F.3d 576, 580 (9th Cir.1995) (“Because each error is, at best, marginal, we cannot conclude that their cumulative effect was ‘so prejudicial’ to [defendant] that reversal is warranted.”); see also Rupe v. Wood, 93 F.3d 1434, 1445 (9th Cir. 1995); Detrich v. Ryan, 740 F.3d 1237, 1273 (9th Cir. 2013). Cumulative error analysis applies where there are two or more actual errors. It does not apply . . . to the cumulative effect of non-errors.” Moore v. Gibson, 195 F.3d 1152, 1175 (10th Cir. 1999) (quoting Castro v. Ward, 138 F.3d 810, 832 (10th Cir. 1998)).

Accordingly, Petitioner has not established that defense counsel's cumulative performance fell below an objective standard of reasonableness and that, but for counsel's unprofessional errors, the result of the proceeding would have been different. Strickland, 466 U.S., at 687-694. Petitioner's reliance on Cargle v. Mullin, 317 F.3d 1196, 1210 (10th Cir. 2003), a case readily distinguished on the facts of ineffective assistance, is misplaced.

Respondent contends this claim is not cognizable because it creates and retroactively applies a “new rule” of constitutional law within Teague v. Lane, 489 U.S. 288. However, the Court finds the claim fails not because Petitioner seeks to apply a new rule of criminal procedure under Teague, but rather on grounds the claim lacks merit for the reasons stated.

1 Claim 18 is denied.

2 5. Denial Of Effective Assistance Of Counsel – Claims 19-27

3 In claims 19 through 27, Petitioner alleges that during the guilt and special circumstance  
4 phase he was denied effective assistance of defense counsel.

5 a. **Clearly Established Law**

6 A breakdown in the attorney-client relationship can result in a denial of the right to  
7 effective assistance of counsel. Frazer v. United States, 18 F.3d 778, 782-83, 785 (9th Cir.  
8 1994); see also Brown v. Craven, 424 F.2d. 1166, 1169-70 (9th Cir. 1970) (trial court's failure to  
9 conduct inquiry into irreconcilable conflict arising from the client's refusal to communicate or  
10 cooperate with counsel resulted in denial of effective assistance of counsel).

11 The Sixth Amendment requires an appropriate, on the record, inquiry into the grounds for  
12 such a motion, and that the matter be resolved on the merits before the case goes forward. Schell  
13 v. Witek, 218 F.3d 1017, 1025, citing Smith v. Lockhart, 923 F.2d 1314, 1320 (8th Cir. 1991)).  
14 The overarching constitutional question is whether the attorney-client conflict has become so  
15 great that "it resulted in a total lack of communication or other significant impediment that  
16 resulted in turn in an attorney-client relationship that fell short of that required by the Sixth  
17 Amendment." Id., at 1026.

18 b. **Review of Claim 19**

19 Petitioner claims trial court error by denial, without adequate investigation, of defense  
20 counsel's motions to withdraw depriving him of effective assistance of counsel, violating his  
21 Sixth, Eighth and Fourteenth Amendment rights.

22 The state supreme court considered this claim on appeal and found that the trial court did  
23 not abuse its discretion in denying defense counsel's two motions to withdraw, as follows:

24  
25 [I]mplicit in the court's denial of the motions is the finding that defendant's  
26 discussion of his case with the media was not an indication of his distrust or  
27 dissatisfaction with counsel. Rather, the conduct was merely indicative of his  
28 unwavering desire to admit culpability and to atone for his crimes. Indeed,  
allowing counsel to withdraw would not have alleviated any prejudice to  
defendant caused by his contact with the press, nor does the record indicate that  
denying the motion to withdraw influenced defendant's desire to submit the guilt

1 issue on the basis of the preliminary hearing transcripts. Even though counsel  
2 were dissatisfied with defendant's failure to heed their advice and not discuss the  
3 case with the media, the record shows defendant's right to counsel was not  
4 jeopardized by counsel's continuing representation. Thus, because defendant does  
5 not show that any disagreement with counsel resulted in a complete breakdown in  
6 the attorney-client relationship that jeopardized his right to a fair trial, we  
7 conclude the trial court did not abuse its discretion in denying counsels' motions  
8 to withdraw. [Citation] In reviewing denial of motion to substitute attorneys, the  
9 court "focuses on the ruling itself and the record on which it is made. It does not  
10 look to subsequent matters . . ."]

11 Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 37.

12 Petitioner alleges that his out-of-court actions revealed a complete breakdown in his  
13 relationship with counsel and that his lack of trust and confidence was not unfounded as counsel  
14 ignored his serious mental disturbances which should have been obvious. Petitioner notified  
15 defense counsel of his intent to speak to the media on February 2, 1988. Later that day counsel  
16 met with Petitioner and advised against contacting the media. After the meeting, counsel  
17 discovered Petitioner had given an interview to Michael Trihey, reporter for the Bakersfield  
18 Californian newspaper, earlier that day. That interview led to a front-page story published on  
19 February 12, 1988.

20 On February 16, 1988, defense counsel filed a motion to withdraw, asserting Petitioner  
21 had indicated he did not trust counsel and actively mislead them by failing to inform them he had  
22 already given an interview to Trihey, Petitioner's refusal to cooperate rendered his representation  
23 virtually impossible, and their attorney-client relationship was so tainted counsel's efforts would  
24 be of no assistance. However, the Court denied the motion because it found no breakdown in the  
25 attorney-client relationship and that any prejudice created by Petitioner's contacting the press  
26 against counsel's advice would not be ameliorated by counsel's withdrawal. On March 7, 1988  
27 the trial court, before denying the initial motion to withdraw, questioned Petitioner about  
28 whether he trusted defense counsel. Petitioner responded that "[he was] willing to stay with  
them." (CT 690, 707-708; RT [3/7/88] 4-5.)

29 On April 25, 1988, another article by Trihey was published in the Bakersfield Californian  
30 that asserted that Petitioner said he was a triple killer who deserved to die and described  
31 Petitioner's legal predicament of not being able to plead guilty and accept the death penalty

1 without his counsel's consent.

2       On May 2, 1988, counsel again moved to withdraw, asserting continued representation  
3 would require unethical conduct by counsel. The trial judge met with defense counsel and  
4 Petitioner regarding counsel's renewed motions to withdraw. The court denied Toton's motion  
5 on the merits on that day. (CT 707; RT [5/6/88] 3.) Four days later the Court denied Frank's  
6 motion due to "nearness of the trial date." (CT 708; RT [5/10/88] 5.) The trial court had  
7 previously noted that substitution of counsel would not alleviate any prejudice to the case already  
8 resulting from Petitioner's discussions with report Trihey. (RT [3/7/88] 5.) On June 22, 1988,  
9 the Court of Appeal of the State of California, Fifth Appellate District, denied Petitioner's  
10 petition for writ of mandate and/or prohibition, seeking an order directing the trial court to grant  
11 counsel's motions to withdraw. (CT 768.)

12       Here, the state court could reasonably have found that any disagreement with counsel was  
13 not so great that it resulted in a complete breakdown in the attorney-client relationship  
14 jeopardizing his right to effective representation and a fair trial. (CT 690; RT [3/7/88] 4-5.) The  
15 contention of defense counsel in their initial (February 1988) motion that the newspaper article  
16 reflected a lack of trust and cooperation (RT March 7, 1988 at pp. 3-4; CT 685-686) was  
17 countered by Petitioner during his colloquy with the trial court. Petitioner stated to the trial judge  
18 that, "[t]here is a little bit of mistrust there, but you know, I'm willing to stay with them, if they  
19 want out, you know, I won't stop them." (RT March 7, 1988 at pp. 4-5; CT 685-686.)

20       Petitioner's assertion that the trial court erred by treating the newspaper interview as the  
21 sole issue, failing to investigate and address the more pervasive problem of mistrust, is  
22 unavailing. Toton's February 1988 withdrawal motion, which raised a lack of trust and  
23 confidence as a result of the newspaper article, was denied by the trial court on the merits (CT  
24 707; RT May 6, 10, and June 24, 1988 at p. 3) following the trial court's above noted discussion  
25 of these very issues with Petitioner. (RT March 7, 1988 at pp. 4-5; CT 685-686.)

26       Petitioner also contends that the second motion to withdraw, brought by Frank in May  
27 1988 and joined in by Toton, was improperly denied. He points out that this motion was  
28

1 unopposed and that the trial court delayed reaching the motion and ultimately did not reach the  
2 merits. Frank's May 1988 withdrawal motion, brought on ethical grounds relating to possibly  
3 perjurious testimony, (CT 694-696; URT<sup>6</sup> (Frank) [5/6/88] 2-8), joined in by Toton, was denied  
4 by the trial court following ex parte in camera hearing because it was too close to trial. (CT 708-  
5 710; RT May 6, 10, and June 24, 1988, at p. 5.) However, the request was devoid of facts  
6 showing the nature and basis for relief requested. (RT May 10, 1988, pp. 4-5, 7-8.) Any ethical  
7 dilemma involving perjurious testimony would not likely have been resolved by appointing  
8 replacement counsel, and the trial court recognized as much. (URT (Frank) [5/6/88] 4-6.)  
9 Petitioner does not allege or support an ethical violation. Even if he had, a lawyer's violation of  
10 ethical norms does not make the lawyer *per se* ineffective. Burt v. Titlow, 134 S. Ct. 10, 18  
11 (2013).

12 Moreover, as with the earlier motion to withdraw, Petitioner was ambivalent, neither  
13 seeking nor objecting to withdrawal. (URT (Frank) [5/6/88] 9; RT [5/6/88] 2.) Petitioner's  
14 contention his defense waiver was a product of ineffective assistance (Pet. ¶¶ 377-380) is refuted  
15 by his expressed desire to plead guilty. (RT [7/27/88] 6-7; URT (Toton) [5/6/88] 2.)

16 Petitioner's suggestion that he lacked confidence in counsel because they ignored his  
17 mental disturbance was not communicated by him to the court and counsel and is not supported  
18 by any proffer in the evidentiary record. Petitioner neither sought nor objected to withdrawal of  
19 defense counsel Toton and Frank, (RT [5/6/88] 2), and had expressed his desire to enter a guilty  
20 plea. (RT [5/16/88] 7.) In accordance therewith, trial was waived on the guilt and special  
21 circumstances phase. (RT [7/27/88] 6-7.) The state court could reasonably have determined that  
22 withdrawal would not have ameliorated any prejudice from Petitioner's contacting the press, or  
23 affected Petitioner's submission on the preliminary hearing. Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 36-37. On  
24 this basis Petitioner's right to counsel was not placed by jeopardy by the continued  
25 representation of defense counsel.

26 Respondent contends this claim is not cognizable because it creates and retroactively  
27

28 <sup>6</sup> The term "URT" is a reference to Unsealed Reporter's Transcripts of ex parte in camera proceedings.

1 applies a “new rule” of constitutional law within Teague v. Lane, 489 U.S. 288. However, the  
2 Court finds the claim fails not because Petitioner seeks to apply a new rule of criminal procedure  
3 under Teague, but rather on grounds the claim lacks merit for the reasons stated.

4 For the reasons stated, the state court rejection of the claim was neither contrary to, or an  
5 unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law, as determined by the Supreme  
6 Court, nor an unreasonable determination of the facts in light of the evidence presented in the  
7 state court proceeding. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

8 Claim 19 is denied.

9 **c. Review of Claim 20**

10 In claim 20, Petitioner alleges ineffective assistance of counsel by complete breakdown  
11 in the attorney/client relationship violating his Sixth, Eighth and Fourteenth Amendment rights.

12 The California Supreme Court summarily denied this claim (SPet. Claim Q) raised in  
13 Petitioner’s state petition for habeas corpus. In re Sanchez, S049502 (DD). The state supreme  
14 court, in its decision on direct appeal, considered Toton’s disciplinary proceedings and noted the  
15 following trial court discussion:

16 “The Court: One of the things that concerns me about this incident is the fact of  
17 the date of August 25th and the fact that a jury trial was waived in this case, and  
18 now we’re at that stage of the case where a [Penal Code section] 1118.1 is under  
19 submission. And I suppose somebody reviewing this case could say one of the  
20 reasons maybe that Mr. Toton suggested that the jury trial be waived was the fact  
21 that the trial could be completed prior to the time that the Californian suggests  
22 that there’s going to be some kind of a ruling in his case. As-and clearly if we had  
23 had a jury, we would still have been going at that time, and I really seriously  
24 doubt whether we would have been in a position even to have begun to take  
evidence as of the 25th day of August. That situation worried me a little bit.

25 “And I wonder if you have discussed this with your client.

26 “Mr. Frank: Yes, your Honor. I advised [defendant] that the article certainly did  
27 imply that Mr. Toton’s motivation for pursuing the presentation of the case in the  
28 manner in which he has, at least indicated, that perhaps he did that because of his  
own personal problems, plans or agenda.

29 “I advised [defendant] that he had the right to be represented by an attorney who  
30 was completely and absolutely free from any sort of conflict, that [defendant] had  
31 the right to have an attorney whose decision-making process was unfettered by  
32 any of his own personal plans or problems, and that he had the right to have an  
33 attorney whose representation and whose decision-making process was based not  
34 on any of the attorney’s considerations but on the best interests of [defendant], the

1 client in this case.”

2 Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 38.

3 Petitioner revisits allegations in claim 19 regarding Toton’s disciplinary issues, and  
4 proffers an unsigned declaration of defense expert Isabel Wright that defense counsel disbelieved  
5 and disregarded Petitioner. (SHCP Ex. 131, Att. B, ¶ 6-9.) However, even if competent  
6 evidence, Wright’s testimony is controverted by that of defense counsel Toton (SHCP Ex. 137,  
7 p. 8) and Frank (SHCP Ex. 113, ¶ 6), that apart from the media interview issue, the attorney-  
8 client relationship was a cooperative one. Moreover, the record shows that the trial court  
9 questioned Petitioner to verify that he had spoken to Frank about the disciplinary proceedings,  
10 that he had read the Bakersfield Californian article, and that he was unaware of any disciplinary  
11 action against Toton prior to the date of the article. The court asked Petitioner if he believed the  
12 article implied that “one reason Mr. Toton was pushing this case forward was because of his own  
13 personal time considerations.” Petitioner replied: “Not really sir, because we had discussed-you  
14 know, this was part- I wanted to go this way in the beginning anyway. So there was really-I  
15 never really felt that he was doing it for his own incidences [sic].” Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 39.

16 The trial court discussed with Petitioner his earlier position that it was his idea alone to  
17 “waive the jury under any circumstances.” Petitioner told the trial court that he wanted to waive  
18 jury trial on the guilty and special circumstances phase and that the idea started with him and not  
19 defense counsel. (RT [7/27/88] 6-7.)

20 The trial court discussed with Petitioner whether he wanted to make a motion for mistrial  
21 “and for certain other motions in view of the publicity that this has gotten?” The following  
22 colloquy took place:

23  
24 “The Court: What I’m concerned [about] is that something will happen down the  
line and then you will say, gee, I didn’t know what I was doing; I should have  
asked for a mistrial at that point in time. That would probably be too late, because  
I’m probably getting an indication that you want to waive any problems that Mr.  
Toton’s difficulties might have in this case. Is that right?

25 “The Defendant: Yes.

26 “The Court: I didn’t make that very clear.

27 “The Defendant: Yeah.

28 “The Court: What I’m saying is, I don’t want you to go down the line and then all

1 of a sudden say, gee, I've changed my mind.  
2 "The Defendant: Yeah.  
3 "The Court: Probably you can't do that. You understand that?  
4 "The Defendant: Yes, I understand that.  
5 "The Court: Are you satisfied with the state of the record at this point?  
6 "The Defendant: Yes sir. I'm very satisfied.  
7 "The Court: Nobody threatened you to get you to say this?  
8 "The Defendant: No, sir ....  
9 "The Court: Are you satisfied, sir, that Mr. Toton's dilemma with the State Bar  
10 had nothing to do with the waiver of the jury trial?  
11 "Mr. Frank: I am, yes.  
12 "The Court: And are you, Mr. Sanchez?  
13 "The Defendant: I am too."

8 Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 39-40.

9 Based on the foregoing, and for the reasons discussed in claim 19, the state court could  
10 reasonably have determined Petitioner did not establish ineffective assistance of counsel  
11 through complete breakdown of the attorney/client relationship. As noted by the state supreme  
12 court, “[i]n order to establish a violation of the right to effective assistance of counsel, a  
13 defendant must show that counsel's performance was inadequate when measured against the  
14 standard of a reasonably competent attorney, and that counsel's performance prejudiced  
15 defendant's case in such a manner that his representation “so undermined the proper functioning  
16 of the adversarial process that the trial cannot be relied on as having produced a just result.”  
17 Strickland, 466 U.S. at 686. The record above does not support such a finding.

18 Moreover, “a court need not determine whether counsel's performance was deficient  
19 before examining the prejudice suffered by the defendant as a result of the alleged deficiencies.”  
20 Strickland, 466 U.S. at p. 697. Prejudice is shown when there is a “reasonable probability that,  
21 but for counsel's unprofessional errors, the result of the proceeding would have been different. A  
22 reasonable probability is a probability sufficient to undermine confidence in the outcome.” In re  
23 Sixto (1989) 48 Cal.3d 1247, 1257; Strickland, 466 U.S. at p. 694. If defendant fails to show  
24 that he was prejudiced by counsel's performance, the ineffective assistance claim may be rejected  
25 without determining whether counsel's performance was inadequate. Strickland, 466 U.S. at p.  
26 697.”

27 Petitioner has not established prejudice. Toton was licensed to practice law until his  
28

1 disbarment on March 31, 1989, after Petitioner's trial was completed. In rejecting this claim on  
2 appeal, the state supreme court pointed out that:

3 [Petitioner] does not assert that Toton's pending discipline prejudiced his case.  
4 The record would not support such an argument. Toton vigorously cross-  
5 examined prosecution witnesses at the preliminary hearing and during the guilt  
6 phase, made several defense motions, including one for appointed assistant  
7 counsel, which was granted, and motions for pretrial discovery, severance and  
8 additional motions that indicated he was vigorously representing his client. In  
9 addition, Toton made a comprehensive closing argument at the guilt phase. Thus,  
10 there is no indication on the record that counsel's representation was anything less  
11 than competent, and defendant fails to persuade us that counsel's representation  
12 was ineffective solely on the basis of the disciplinary action pending against him.  
13 . . . Toton was a member of the State Bar at all times during his representation of  
14 defendant. " 'Erring morally or by a breach of professional ethics does not  
15 necessarily indicate a lack of knowledge of the law.'" [Citation] We simply are  
16 not persuaded that Toton's unrelated disciplinary problems in any way influenced  
17 his representation of defendant or otherwise rendered him unfit as a matter of law.  
18 [Citation]

19 Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 43-45.

20 Petitioner's contention that defense counsel found him uncooperative is refuted by Mr.  
21 Frank's declaration where he said that, except for the media interviews, Petitioner was  
22 cooperative with defense counsel. (SPet. Ex. 113, p. 3.) As to the alleged ethical dilemma, as  
23 noted a lawyer's violation of ethical norms does not make the lawyer *per se* ineffective. Burt,  
24 134 S. Ct. at 18.

25 Respondent contends this claim is not cognizable because it creates and retroactively  
26 applies a "new rule" of constitutional law within Teague v. Lane, 489 U.S. 288. However, the  
27 Court finds the claim fails not because Petitioner seeks to apply a new rule of criminal procedure  
28 under Teague, but rather on grounds the claim lacks merit for the reasons stated.

29 The Court finds that, the reasons discussed, the state court rejection of the claim was  
30 neither contrary to, or an unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law, as  
31 determined by the Supreme Court, nor an unreasonable determination of the facts in light of the  
32 evidence presented in the state court proceeding. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

33 Claim 20 is denied.

34 **d. Analysis - Claims 21-24**

1 Petitioner claims denial of effective assistance of counsel through the appointment of  
2 Toton as lead counsel and the failure to replace him notwithstanding his conflicts of interest and  
3 Petitioner's insufficient waiver thereof, violating his Sixth, Eighth, and Fourteenth Amendment  
4 rights.

5 The California Supreme Court summarily denied claims 21, 23 and 24 (SPet. Claims P, R  
6 and S respectively) raised in Petitioner's state petition for habeas corpus. In re Sanchez,  
7 S049502 (DD). As noted, in such a case "the habeas petitioner's burden still must be met by  
8 showing there was no reasonable basis for the state court to deny relief," Richter, 562 U.S. at 98,  
9 and this Court "must determine what arguments or theories supported or . . . *could have*  
10 *supported*, the state court's decision; and then it must ask whether it is possible fair-minded  
11 jurists could disagree that those arguments or theories are inconsistent with the holding in a prior  
12 decision of this Court." Id. (emphasis added).

13 The state supreme court, in reviewing these issues on direct appeal, noted that:

14 Defendant's claim that Toton's disciplinary proceedings rendered him  
15 incompetent is no more persuasive if considered under the rubric of conflict of  
16 interest. A criminal defendant's right to effective assistance of counsel,  
17 guaranteed by both the state and federal Constitutions, includes the right to  
18 representation free from conflicts of interest. [Citation] To establish a violation  
19 of the right to unconflicted counsel under the federal Constitution, 'a defendant  
20 who raised no objection at trial must demonstrate that an actual conflict of  
interest adversely affected his lawyer's performance.' [Citation] To establish a  
violation of the same right under our state Constitution, a defendant need only  
show that the record supports an 'informed speculation' that counsel's  
representation of the defendant was adversely affected by the claimed conflict of  
interest. [Citation]

21 [W]e also observed that "[c]onflicts of interest may arise in various factual  
22 settings. Broadly, they 'embrace all situations in which an attorney's loyalty to, or  
efforts on behalf of, a client are threatened by his responsibilities to another  
client or a third person or by his own interests.'" [Citation]

23 Defendant contends that the alleged conflict of interest between himself and  
24 Toton was caused by Toton's "own interest" in expediting the trial prior to his  
disbarment, to the defendant's prejudice. Defendant asserts that the fact of the  
25 pending disciplinary action gave Toton a strong incentive to finish defendant's  
case as quickly as possible, implying that Toton's desire to end the case led to a  
constitutionally deficient performance.

26 Based on the appellate record, we are not persuaded by defendant's arguments.  
27 As we have observed, the record shows that Toton was not disbarred until eight  
months after the court and defendant learned of the proceedings against him, and

1 one month after completion of the penalty phase of defendant's trial. There is no  
2 indication that the disciplinary proceedings influenced the pace of Toton's  
3 representation, and, indeed, there is substantial evidence on record that would  
4 support the opposite conclusion.

5 First and foremost, it was Toton who advised defendant not to plead guilty and  
6 instead to submit the guilt and special circumstance issues on the basis of the  
7 preliminary hearing transcripts. This alternative to a guilty plea allowed counsel  
8 to contest the People's case, present various defense motions to the court, and  
9 generally make a stronger case for defendant than would have been available  
10 following a guilty plea. Thus, counsel Toton actually prolonged the trial  
11 notwithstanding defendant's desire to proceed directly to the penalty phase.

12 Moreover, even if we were to perceive either an actual conflict of interest, as  
13 required by federal law, or to conclude the record supports an "informed  
14 speculation" of a conflict as required under our state Constitution, defendant  
15 intentionally and knowingly waived any conflict on the record. [Citation]

16 In addition, defense counsel Frank informed the court he was satisfied that  
17 Toton's pending discipline "had nothing to do with the waiver of the jury trial."  
18 At a later in camera hearing attended by defense counsel Frank, defendant  
19 admitted that, in partially submitting his case, it was his desire to waive jury trial  
20 "under any circumstances," that he had had a "lengthy discussion" regarding his  
21 rights with defense counsel Frank, and that he wanted to maintain the status quo.

22 The fact that defendant did not discuss Toton's pending discipline with him does  
23 not assist defendant's conflict claim. Here, defendant asserts that his "discussion  
24 with Frank could not substitute for a discussion with Toton. By his own  
25 admission, Frank knew nothing about his co-counsel's impending [discipline]  
26 until the news appeared on the front page of the Bakersfield newspaper . . . .  
27 Toton hid this important fact from his own assistant counsel until the news  
28 became public. Nothing in the record indicates that Frank knew any more about  
the [discipline] than did the readers of the Bakersfield Californian. Frank simply  
was not able to speak for Toton in discussing the impact of the [disciplinary  
proceedings] on the future conduct of the defense [nor was] Frank in [a] position  
to discuss with [defendant] how the [disciplinary] proceedings already might  
have affected Toton's guilt phase strategy." Defendant fails to show, however,  
how Toton's assurances or perspective would have assisted him in determining  
whether he wanted to waive the conflict, or how Toton would have provided him  
with a better explanation than that given by the court about the potential  
drawbacks of Toton's continued representation.

29 Defendant next asserts that the trial court failed in its duty to ensure that he  
30 knowingly and intelligently waived any conflict with counsel. "When a trial  
31 court knows or should know that defense counsel has a possible conflict of  
32 interest with his client, it must inquire into the matter [citations] and act in  
33 response to what its inquiry discovers [Citation]." If the court determines that a  
34 waiver of a conflict is necessary, it must satisfy itself that "'(1) the defendant has  
35 discussed the potential drawbacks of [potentially conflicted] representation with  
36 his attorney, or if he wishes, outside counsel, (2) that he has been made aware of  
37 the dangers and possible consequences of [such] representation in his case, (3)  
38 that he knows of his right to conflict-free representation, and (4) that he  
39 voluntarily wishes to waive that right.'" [Citation] A trial court's failure to inquire  
40 into the conflict or to adequately respond to its inquiry amounts to reversible  
41 error if the defendant can show "that an actual conflict of interest existed and that

1 that conflict adversely affected counsel's performance." [Citation]

2 Defendant asserts that the trial court "never asked [defendant] in clear,  
3 unambiguous language whether he was willing to waive his right to unimpaired  
4 counsel." He also complains of the court's failure to "determine whether  
5 [Toton's] alleged misuse of client funds might indicate that Toton had financial  
6 difficulties which might affect his work or handling of funds in [defendant's]  
7 case, [nor did the court] ask Toton about the timetable of state bar proceedings  
8 [or ask] how the bar proceeding might affect, or might have affected, Toton's  
9 conduct of [defendant's] case."

10 In deciding whether a defendant understands the nature of a possible conflict of  
11 interest with counsel, the trial court need not explore each foreseeable conflict  
12 and consequence. [Citation] Nor does a defendant's waiver of conflict-free  
13 counsel extend merely to matters discussed on the record. [Citation] As we  
14 observed in [Citation] "[r]ules that are that strict seem neither necessary nor  
15 workable." [Citation] (waiver found adequate even though all conceivable  
16 ramifications of conflict not explained). Thus, looking at the whole record, we  
17 must determine whether defendant was aware of the potential drawbacks and  
18 possible consequences of retaining Toton, and whether he understood his right to  
19 conflict-free counsel and knowingly waived that right.

20 It is clear that the record belies defendant's argument. The court's response to the  
21 asserted conflict of interest was appropriate under the circumstances; it was  
22 immediate and informed petitioner of his rights under the facts. As the record  
23 indicates, the court discussed the conflict with the parties, was careful to ensure  
24 defendant was aware that a conflict existed, and confirmed that his waiver of the  
25 conflict was voluntary and knowing. [Citation] Defendant even declined the  
26 court's invitation to make a motion for mistrial, emphasizing that he was satisfied  
27 with the state of the record. Thus, in light of all the circumstances, we conclude  
28 the court gave defendant an opportunity to declare a mistrial, to relieve counsel,  
and to voice his objections on the record. In our view, the trial court conducted  
an adequate inquiry into the conflict, and we are satisfied that defendant's waiver  
was knowing and voluntary. [Citation]

19 Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 45-48.

20 The Sixth Amendment provides that a criminal defendant shall have the right to "the  
21 Assistance of Counsel for his defense." As a general matter, a defendant alleging a Sixth  
22 Amendment violation must demonstrate "a reasonable probability that, but for counsel's  
23 unprofessional errors, the result of the proceeding would have been different." Strickland, 466  
24 U.S. at 694.

25 An exception exists for cases in which counsel actively represents conflicting interests.

26 Mickens v. Taylor, 535 U.S. 162, 166 (2002); Cuyler v. Sullivan, 446 U.S. 335, 345-50 (1980).  
27 In such a case, prejudice is presumed. Id. However, Petitioner must establish that "an actual

1 conflict of interest actually affected the adequacy of [defense counsel's] representation.”  
2 Sullivan, 446 U.S. at 348-49. Thus, “until a defendant shows that his counsel *actively*  
3 *represented* conflicting interests, he has not established the constitutional predicate for his claim  
4 of ineffective assistance.” Id. at 350 (emphasis in original).

5 Petitioner supports these claims in part with facts alleged in claims 5 and 6. He contends  
6 that Toton, who had state bar disciplinary proceedings pending against him at the time he was  
7 appointed to Petitioner’s case. He contends Toton obtained his bar license by fraud. He  
8 contends that Toton had conflicts of interest relating to disbarment proceedings which should  
9 have resulted in replacement lead counsel and a jury trial at the guilt and special circumstance  
10 phase. However, there is no competent evidence Toton obtained his law license by fraud (SHCP  
11 Ex. 133, Att. A), or that he engaged in the practice of law prior to his admission to the bar.  
12 (SHCP Exhs. 514; 516-18.) Toton was not disbarred until March 31, 1989, five months after the  
13 penalty phase verdict. (SHCP Ex. 519.)

14 Petitioner faults the trial court for failure to conduct an adequate inquiry into Toton’s  
15 possible conflict of interest, noting Toton was never questioned. (Sealed RT July 26, 1988, at  
16 pp. 80-84.) However, the trial judge did look into the pending disciplinary proceedings against  
17 Toton and discussed such with the parties and Petitioner. See Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 47. The  
18 Court provided Petitioner the opportunity to “declare a mistrial, to relieve counsel, and to voice  
19 his objections to the record.” Id. In response Petitioner voluntarily, knowingly and intentionally  
20 waived any conflict of interest on the record following a discussion with co-counsel Frank and  
21 the trial court as to his rights to conflict free representation and potential drawbacks and  
22 consequences of staying with Toton (RT [7/27/88] 3, 4-10), as reflected by his statement he  
23 wanted to maintain the status quo. (RT [7/27/88] 8.) He refused the court’s invitation for  
24 mistrial, to relieve counsel, and to object to the record. Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 47.

25 The evidentiary record does not reflect that Toton’s litigation of the case was influenced  
26 by an actual conflict arising from the disciplinary proceedings. See Burger, 483 U.S. at 783.  
27 Petitioner’s argument that, had the trial court pressed the inquiry, Toton would have withdrawn  
28

1 or been replaced and a full defense then mounted, is based upon speculation. The trial court  
2 could reasonably have found that there was no actual unwaived conflict of interest. The state  
3 court could have concluded that Petitioner understood what he was waiving, was “very satisfied”  
4 with the record and acting voluntarily, (RT [7/27/88] 8), and that Toton’s situation had “nothing  
5 to do with his waiver of the jury trial.” (RT [7/27/88] 9-10.)

6 Petitioner’s contention that he should have been allowed to discuss Toton’s alleged  
7 conflict with Toton himself or outside counsel is unaccompanied by any evidentiary proffer how  
8 that would have resulted in a more favorable outcome. The state supreme court found that “the  
9 fact disciplinary proceedings were pending against counsel Toton did not automatically render  
10 Toton’s performance inadequate or prejudice [Petitioner’s] right to effective counsel.” Sanchez,  
11 12 Cal.4th at 44. The court further found that Toton engaged in vigorous witness examination  
12 and cross-examination (CT 518-625; RT 2664-2670), pre-trial discovery (CT 649-663, 769),  
13 preemptory challenges (CT 836-840) evidentiary motions (CT 841-45, 846-53, 854-58, RT 80,  
14 97-113), and closing argument. (RT 169-96.) All this supported the conclusion that Toton’s  
15 representation was adequate. The state supreme court also found “no indication that the  
16 disciplinary proceedings influenced the pace of Toton’s representation.” Sanchez 12 Cal.4th at  
17 45:2). Nothing in the state record suggests otherwise.

18 For the reasons discussed in claims 19 and 20, *ante*, Petitioner has not established denial  
19 of effective assistance of counsel through denial of defense counsel motions to withdraw,  
20 breakdown of the attorney-client relationship by virtue of Toton’s debarment proceedings, or  
21 waiver of jury trial at the guilt and special circumstance phase. The assertion in claims 21-24,  
22 that the trial court did not sufficiently investigate defense counsel’s alleged conflict of interest  
23 similarly fails for the same reasons.

24 Petitioner expressed his desire to plead guilty, to stay with Toton following discussion  
25 with the court and defense counsel. Toton, assisted by co-counsel Frank, vigorously cross-  
26 examined witnesses and made a variety of pretrial and trial motions and made a detailed guilt  
27 phase closing argument, thereby distinguishing this matter from Petitioner’s cited People v.  
28

1 Williams, 93 Ill.2d 309 (1982) and People v. Rainge, 112 Ill.App.3d 396 (1983). Petitioner was  
2 aware of the possible problems with Toton's continued representation and his right to conflict  
3 free representation, having discussed these matters with co-counsel Frank for approximately an  
4 hour, and Petitioner thereafter expressly waived any such conflict. (RT [7/27/88] 4-10.)  
5 Petitioner argues that defense counsel Frank lacked sufficient information about Toton's  
6 disciplinary proceedings to discuss the matter with Petitioner, (SHCP Ex. 137, ¶ 16), but makes  
7 no proffer of how and why this was so and cause him prejudice. Frank believed that Toton's  
8 disciplinary issues did not affect the proceedings. (Sealed RT July 27, 1988, at p. 9-10.)

9 Petitioner's re-argument that neuropsychological deficits (organic impairments) and  
10 neurological and psychiatric disorders (psychiatric impairments) prevented him from  
11 competently waiving the conflict fails substantively for the reasons stated in claims 1-4 and 6.  
12 As discussed in those claims, Dr. Foster's 1995 opinion of Petitioner's mental state, that there is  
13 a high probability Petitioner suffered neuropsychological and psychiatric disorders and  
14 impairments during the pretrial and trial period, does not demonstrate the trial court decision to  
15 allow Toton to continue as lead counsel was unreasonable.

16 At bottom, Petitioner has not demonstrated Toton had an actual conflict of interest. See  
17 Garcia v. Bunnell 33 F.3d 1193, 1198 (9th Cir. 1994) (no actual conflict where record discloses  
18 no active representation of competing interest); see also Burger, 483 U.S. at 783; Mickens, 535  
19 U.S. at 171 ("[A]n actual conflict of interest [means] precisely a conflict that affected counsel's  
20 performance—as opposed to a mere theoretical division of loyalties."). To meet this standard, he  
21 must show "that the attorney's behavior seems to have been influenced by the conflict," which,  
22 though not a showing of actual prejudice, "remains a substantial hurdle." Lockhart v. Terhune,  
23 250 F.3d 1223, 1231 (9th Cir. 2001). Even if he had demonstrated actual conflict, Petitioner has  
24 not demonstrated that his waiver the conflict was invalid. Garcia, 33 F.3d at 1195 (9th Cir.  
25 1994);

26 Respondent contends claims 21, 22 and 24 are not cognizable because each creates and  
27 retroactively applies a "new rule" of constitutional law within Teague v. Lane, 489 U.S. 288.  
28

1 However, the Court finds the claims fail not because Petitioner seeks to apply a new rule of  
2 criminal procedure under Teague, but rather on grounds the claims lack merit for the reasons  
3 stated.

4 A fair-minded jurist could have found that rejection of these claims was neither contrary  
5 to, or an unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law, as determined by the  
6 Supreme Court, nor an unreasonable determination of the facts in light of the evidence presented  
7 in the state court proceeding. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

8 Claims 21-24 are denied.

9 **e. Review of Claims 25-26**

10 Petitioner next claims that he was not competent to waive trial by jury and confrontation  
11 and cross-examination of witnesses and presentation of a defense, and that he was not competent  
12 to stand trial, violating his Sixth, Eighth, and Fourteenth Amendment rights. He supports these  
13 claims with facts alleged in denied claims 6 through 10 and 14.

14 The California Supreme Court summarily denied claims 25 and 26 (SPet. Claims W and  
15 T respectively) raised in Petitioner's state petition for habeas corpus. In re Sanchez, S049502  
16 (DD). As noted, in such a case "the habeas petitioner's burden still must be met by showing  
17 there was no reasonable basis for the state court to deny relief," Richter, 562 U.S. at 98, and this  
18 Court "must determine what arguments or theories supported or . . . could have supported, the  
19 state court's decision; and then it must ask whether it is possible fair-minded jurists could  
20 disagree that those arguments or theories are inconsistent with the holding in a prior decision of  
21 this Court." Id. (emphasis added).

22 *i. Trial Waivers*

23 The state supreme court found Petitioner knowingly, voluntarily and intelligently waived  
24 rights when it considered the matter on direct appeal. This Court agrees, for the reasons  
25 discussed in claims 6, 14 and 21-24. The trial court allowed Toton to inform Petitioner of his  
26 constitutional rights, which Petitioner acknowledged he was waiving "freely and voluntarily."  
27 Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 24-25. Petitioner's suggestion he did not receive a sufficient narrative  
28

1 explanation of rights waived is refuted by the evidentiary record. Toton informed the trial court  
2 he had discussed the guilt and special circumstance submission and waiver with Petitioner, who  
3 agreed to the procedure. (RT-10a.) Petitioner expressly declined the offer of more time to  
4 consider the waiver decision, stating that he was “very confident” of his decision. See Sanchez,  
5 12 Cal.4th at 26; CT 889-892; RT-10a, 98a-100a.). Petitioner then entered jury trial, compulsory  
6 process, confrontation and cross-examination and presentation of evidence waivers on the  
7 record. (CT 891; RT- 108a-114a.) Petitioner confirmed the waivers the next day, July 14, 1988.  
8 (CT 892; RT-115a.) Petitioner’s argument that medication he received during his incarceration  
9 impacted the waivers (SHCP Exhs. 111, ¶ 64; 601) is not sufficiently supported in the  
10 evidentiary record.

11           *ii.       Slow Guilty Plea*

12           The State Supreme Court also considered on direct appeal Petitioner’s argument that the  
13 submission for court trial was a “slow plea” unaccompanied by waivers sufficient under Boykin-  
14 Tahl. That court found no “slow plea” because defense counsel called and cross-examined  
15 witnesses, retained the right to present additional evidence, attempted to impeach Hernandez,  
16 moved to strike testimony, moved for judgment of acquittal on insufficiency of the evidence,  
17 argued against first degree murder, and made an extensive closing argument. Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th  
18 at 28-30. That court also ruled there was no surrender of the rights against self-incrimination  
19 (because Petitioner chose not to testify at the guilt phase) and no prejudicial error from any  
20 failure to advise Petitioner of the consequences of conviction, noting that:

21           Defendant had been thoroughly advised by counsel of the consequences of  
22 pleading guilty and of the consequences of waiving his constitutional rights. He  
23 was well aware that he faced a possible death sentence, and, according to reporter  
24 Trihey, even asked for his own death. It is clear from the record that defendant  
would have waived his right to a jury trial and insisted on the submission of the  
guilt phase on the preliminary hearing transcripts even if he was specifically told  
by the court that he faced a possible death sentence.

25  
26 Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 30-31.  
27  
28

1 At trial, Petitioner was questioned about the charges pending and consequences of  
2 conviction:

3 "Mr. Toton: And you also understand the nature of the charges against you in this  
4 proceeding; is that correct?

5 "The Defendant: Yes, sir.

6 Mr. Toton: All right, and that there are three counts of homicide alleged with  
7 special circumstances.

8 The Defendant: Yes.

9 Mr. Toton: Thank you, your Honor.

10 The Court: And I take it, sir, that you have done all this freely and voluntarily?

11 The Defendant: Yes, sir.

12 The Court: No one has threatened you?

13 The Defendant: No, sir.

14 The Court: And you have done this after consultation with both of your lawyers?

15 The Defendant: Yes, sir.

16 The Court: Thank you.

17 (CT 889; RT- 65a-68a.)

18 Petitioner was given time to consider the waiver which did not become final until the  
19 following day, when he confirmed the waiver and that it was made freely and voluntarily. (CT  
20 891-892; RT-115a.)

21 The Court finds the "slow plea" claim is not adequately supported by the state record.  
22 Petitioner consulted with defense counsel prior to the waivers and submission to court trial;  
23 repeatedly stated his desire to plead guilty; and acquiesced to counsel's urging to allow cross-  
24 examination and argument in his defense. The California Supreme Court's determination of facts  
25 was not unreasonable in light of the evidence above and Petitioner's desire to plead guilty. (RT –  
26 87a.) That court's rejection of Petitioner's claims neither contrary to, nor an unreasonable  
27 application of, United States Supreme Court precedent.

28 *iii. Competency for trial*

29 Petitioner maintains Dr. Matychowiak, who conducted his psychiatric evaluation in  
30 November 1987, erred in finding him competent to stand trial because: (1) the opinion was  
31 based on a single, inefficient interview, (2) the conclusion relies almost exclusively on  
32 Petitioner's statements and are not corroborated by independent evidence, (3) insufficient  
33 information was obtained about several important factors, including Petitioner's history of severe  
34

1 childhood trauma and extreme neurological deficits, (4) the effect of signs of potential brain  
2 damage, including history of head injury, paint sniffing and PCP use, as well findings of poor  
3 “theoretical and general judgment” were not considered, (5) the effect of signs of depression,  
4 suicidal intentions, and self-mutilation were not considered, (6) no questions were asked about  
5 Petitioner’s understanding of the nature of the proceedings or his ability to consult with or assist  
6 counsel, and (7) the diagnosis of borderline personality disorder with a past history of substance  
7 abuse did not follow logically from findings of head injury, severe drug abuse, depression,  
8 suicidal tendencies and poor theoretical and general judgment.

9       A defendant is not competent to stand trial if he lacks “sufficient present ability to consult  
10 with his lawyer with a reasonable degree of rational understanding—and a rational as well as  
11 factual understanding of the proceedings against him.” Dusky v. United States, 362 U.S. 402  
12 (1960). A state may legislate the presumption that defendants are competent to stand trial and  
13 require defendants to bear the burden of proving that they are not. Medina v. California, 505  
14 U.S. 437, 449 (1992).

15       Petitioner has not made a sufficient showing that he was erroneously deemed mentally  
16 competent. Petitioner’s contention his neuropsychological deficits (organic impairments) and  
17 neurological and psychiatric disorders (psychiatric impairments) prevented him from  
18 competently standing trial and making the above waivers fails substantively for the reasons  
19 stated in claim 6. Petitioner did not suffer hallucinations or delusions memory lapse at this time.  
20 (SPet. Ex. 520, p. 5.) He wanted to enter a guilty plea, though his attorneys had not allowed him  
21 to do so. (Id. at p. 2-4.) Dr. Matychowiak found that Petitioner

22  
23       [Q]uite clearly understand(s) his situation and has the comprehension of the court  
24 processes. He is able to discuss himself, his decisions and his reasoning for his  
25 decisions . . . At the present time he shows evidence of a basic personality  
disorder. However, this does not make him unable to understand court procedures  
or his need for his own defense. It does not appear to significantly interfere with  
his capacity to cooperate with his attorney.”

26 Id., at 5-6. Dr. Matychowiak found Petitioner “presently able to understand the nature and  
27 purpose of proceedings taken against him” and “to cooperate in a rational manner with counsel

1 in presenting a defense.” (SPet. Ex. 520, p.6.)

2 As discussed above, defense psychologist Donaldson, who examined Petitioner prior to  
3 the preliminary hearing, found Petitioner to be of average intelligence with no deficits in reality  
4 testing or thought disorder. (SPet. Ex. 106, p. 2.) Defense counsel were entitled to rely on the  
5 expert’s opinions, and were not obligated, without a request for information from the expert, to  
6 investigate further in these regards. Hendricks v. Calderon, 70 F.3d 1032, 1038 (9th Cir. 1995);  
7 cf., Silva v. Woodford, 279 F.3d 825, 842-43 (9th Cir. 2002) (trial counsel deficient if inadequate  
8 investigation into background and mental health: at guilt if expert requests information; and at  
9 penalty if the information is mitigating).

10 Petitioner points to declarations included with the state habeas petition by psychologists  
11 Doane and Froming (SHCP Exhs. 105 and 114 respectively) and psychiatrist Foster (SHCP Ex.  
12 111). These experts opine that Petitioner had a history of heavy paint sniffing and PCP abuse  
13 (SHCP, Ex. 111, ¶ 90), and suffered significant organic brain damage and neuropsychological  
14 deficits and post-traumatic stress disorder at the time of his trial waivers. (SHCP Exhs. 105, ¶¶  
15 153-165; 111, ¶¶ 60-69). Petitioner contends that, as of December 1987, he was considered a  
16 “mentally unstable inmate” based on his bizarre behavior, overwhelming guilt and depression,  
17 instability, possible hallucinations and a suicide attempt. (SCHP Ex. 601.)

18 However, to the extent that these declarations can be considered evidence, they were not  
19 presented to the California Supreme Court in his appeal. As to claims adjudicated in the appeal,  
20 the Court cannot consider these declarations here. Pinholster, 131 S. Ct. at 1398. Even if they  
21 could be considered, they are not sufficient evidence in support of the claims for the reasons  
22 stated. Petitioner was mentally competent for reasons discussed in claims 6, and knowingly and  
23 voluntarily made the waivers for reasons discussed in claims 14 and 21through 24.

24 Due process requires a state to provide access to competent psychiatric assistance when a  
25 defendant demonstrates that his sanity at the time of the offense will be a significant factor at  
26 trial. Ake v. Oklahoma, 470 U.S. 68, 83 (1985). However, an indigent defendant does not have  
27 a constitutional right to hire the psychiatrist of his choice. Id. Petitioner’s claim that the court-  
28

1 hired psychiatrist, Dr. Matychowiak, was incompetent is foreclosed by Harris v. Vasquez, 949  
2 F.2d 1497, 1517 (9th Cir. 1990), which refused to expand Ake to encompass a “battle of  
3 experts.” Id., at 1517-18 (citing Silagy v. Peters, 905 F.2d 986, 1013 (7th Cir. 1990)).  
4 “Allowing such battles of psychiatric opinions during successive collateral challenges to a death  
5 sentence would place federal courts in a psycho-legal quagmire resulting in the total abuse of the  
6 habeas process.” Id. at 1518.

7 Dr. Matychowiak was aware of Petitioner’s history of substance abuse (SPet. Ex. 520, pp.  
8 3-4), and found Petitioner competent to stand trial. (SPet. Ex. 520, pp. 2-6.) Dr. Matychowiak  
9 found that Petitioner understood his situation and the court process, had the capacity to cooperate  
10 with his attorney and wanted to plead guilty and “get it over with.” (SPet. Ex. 520, pp. 2-6.)  
11 Moreover, Petitioner’s coherent interaction with the trial court and counsel, and defense  
12 counsel’s failure to raise any competency concern, are some evidence Petitioner was then  
13 competent. See United States v. Lewis, 991 F.2d 524, 528 (9th Cir. 1993). Petitioner’s alleged  
14 facts are not sufficient to create real and substantial doubt as to his competency. See Boag v.  
15 Raines, 769 F.2d 1341, 1343, (9th Cir. 1985).

16 For the reasons stated, a fair-minded jurist could have found that the state court rejection  
17 of these claims was neither contrary to, or an unreasonable application of, clearly established  
18 federal law, as determined by the Supreme Court, nor an unreasonable determination of the facts  
19 in light of the evidence presented in the state court proceeding. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

20 Claims 25-26 are denied.

21 **f. Review of Claim 27<sup>7</sup>**

22 In his next claim, Petitioner alleges the trial court misapplied the California Shield Law  
23 to reporter Trihey’s testimony, violating Petitioner’s rights to confrontation, due process, a fair  
24 trial and compulsory process under the Sixth, Eighth, and Fourteenth Amendments.

25 The California Supreme Court rejected this claim on direct appeal. Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at  
26 52-58.

27  
28 <sup>7</sup> The legal basis of the Eighth Amendment was stricken as unexhausted. ECF No. 60 at 9:4.

1 The California Shield Law<sup>8</sup> states in pertinent part that:

2 A publisher, editor, reporter, or other person connected with or employed upon a  
3 newspaper, magazine, or other periodical publication, or by a press association or  
4 wire service, or any person who has been so connected or employed, shall not be  
5 adjudged in contempt by a judicial, legislative, or administrative body, or any  
6 other body having the power to issue subpoenas, for refusing to disclose the  
7 source of any information procured while so connected or employed for  
8 publication in a newspaper, magazine or other periodical publication, or for  
9 refusing to disclose any unpublished information obtained or prepared in  
10 gathering, receiving or processing of information for communication to the  
11 public. "As used in this subdivision, 'unpublished information' includes  
12 information not disseminated to the public by the person from whom disclosure is  
13 sought, whether or not related information has been disseminated and includes,  
14 but is not limited to, all notes, outtakes, photographs, tapes or other data of  
15 whatever sort not itself disseminated to the public through a medium of  
16 communication, whether or not published information based upon or related to  
17 such material has been disseminated."

18 The state supreme court considered this claim and noted the burden on Petitioner:

19 Faced with a claim of privilege, the burden is on the party seeking to avoid the  
20 privilege competently to demonstrate not only that the evidence sought is relevant  
21 and necessary to his case, but that it is not available from a source less intrusive  
22 upon the privilege. Moreover, as with any attempt to discover evidence subject to  
23 a claim of privilege, a defendant must show a reasonable possibility that the  
24 evidence sought might result in his exoneration." [Citation]

25 Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 52.

26 Trihey testified during the guilt phase subject to invocation of the newsperson's shield  
27 law. He testified that during interviews that Petitioner had told him he was "triple murderer" and  
28 that "all three were killed for their Social Security checks." (RT 18.) These statements were  
published in the Bakersfield Californian on April 25, 1988. (RT 17-18.)

29 Toton objected to use of the newsperson's shield law to protect unpublished information  
30 in Trihey's possession. The trial court ruled for such protection, limiting Toton's cross-  
31 examination to only published information and finding that impeachment of Trihey was not at  
32 issue. (RT 57-59.) Toton then decline further cross-examination of Trihey. (RT 65.)

33 Petitioner alleges that the trial court's misapplication of California Shield Law to reporter  
34 Trihey's testimony caused defense counsel Toton to decline any cross-examination of Trihey,  
35 denying Petitioner an effective defense.

36  
37  
38 <sup>8</sup> California Constitution, article I, section 2, subdivision (b); Cal. Evid. Code §1070 contains substantially similar  
language. See Delaney v. Superior Court, 50 Cal.3d 785, 796 (1990).

1 The state court found Petitioner failed to carry his burden:

2  
3 In attempting to meet his burden, defendant attacks his own credibility by  
4 claiming he made inconsistent statements during the course of the interviews that  
5 would have exposed his confused state of mind at the time the interviews took  
6 place. He asserts his alleged unpublished statements also could have been used to  
7 impeach Trihey's testimony that defendant had told him he was a "triple  
8 murderer" and that "all three were killed for their social security checks." But  
9 defendant never shows how the information he sought would materially assist his  
10 defense, or how it differed in content from the testimony and published  
11 information available for cross-examination, including defendant's statements that  
12 he was scared, that he had taken phencyclidine (PCP), and that he had not  
13 murdered anyone. Defendant simply asserts that he "needed discovery of, and  
14 cross-examination about, the unpublished records of the interviews to impeach  
15 Trihey's testimony. Unlike other statements attributed to [defendant] in the April  
16 25th article, Trihey's 'triple murderer' assertion was not a direct quotation. Rather,  
17 it was a conclusion drawn by Trihey. Trihey's unpublished material might have  
18 shown that his 'triple murder' testimony was his own interpretation of  
19 [defendant's] account, not an actual admission. Moreover, discovery and cross-  
20 examination might have proven that Trihey's conclusion was not supported by the  
21 interviews. The tapes might have shown that [defendant] never said he was a  
22 'triple murderer' or a 'triple killer'; that he did not hit either Juan or Juanita; that he  
23 did nothing to aid or abet Joey; that he did not intend that either Juan or Juanita be  
24 killed; that he tried to stop Joey from killing his parents; or that he feels guilty  
25 because he failed to prevent the homicides. Any of these possibilities would have  
bolstered [defendant's] insufficiency of the evidence argument."

26 The alleged evidence defendant claims would have materially assisted his defense  
27 consists of nothing more than self-serving statements that a court could  
28 reasonably conclude were either too speculative to assist defendant or would  
harm, rather than materially assist, the defense. Indeed, this case is similar to  
[Citation], in which the court rejected the defendant's attempt to attack his own  
credibility by subpoenaing a reporter's unpublished interview notes. Based on this  
record, and under the more recent [citation] threshold test, we find that defendant  
has failed to make the threshold showing that publication of alleged unpublished  
interview information possessed by Trihey would have materially assisted the  
defense and defeated Trihey's claim of immunity under the shield law.

26 In addition, for the same reasons noted above, we reject defendant's claim that he  
27 was denied his right to confront and cross-examine Trihey and to discover and  
28 present evidence under the Sixth and Fourteenth Amendments. The record shows  
the court rejected Trihey's statements as proof that defendant killed the victims for  
their Social Security checks. Moreover, the court found untrue the special  
circumstance allegations that the murders of Juan and Juanita Bocanegra were  
committed during a robbery and found defendant not guilty of the robbery in  
connection with that crime. Thus, it appears the court afforded little weight to  
Trihey's testimony, and defendant was not denied his federal constitutional right  
to a fair trial simply because the court allowed the testimony to be introduced.

26 Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 56-58.

27 The state supreme court also rejected Petitioner's assertion that counsel's failure to cross-

1 examine Trihey before closing argument denied him the effective assistance of counsel under  
2 article I, section 15 of the California Constitution, and the Sixth and Fourteenth Amendments to  
3 the federal Constitution, noting that:

4  
5 In order to succeed in his claim, “defendant must show (1) deficient performance  
6 under an objective standard of professional reasonableness and (2) prejudice  
under a test of reasonable probability of an adverse effect on the outcome.”  
[Citation] Defendant does not satisfy either prong of the foregoing test.

7 As discussed, Toton convinced the court during his closing argument that Trihey's  
8 testimony should not be given substantial weight; his decision not to cross-  
examine Trihey as to the contents of the published material was sound strategy,  
9 given the nature of defendant's alleged contradictory statements. Defendant does  
10 not establish that cross-examination would have revealed any new information, or  
11 that any additional information about the interviews would have influenced the  
12 court's judgment. Hence, we cannot find counsel's failure to cross-examination  
Trihey to be deficient. In any event, given the fact that the court dismissed the  
robbery charges against defendant, and found not true the robbery-murder special-  
circumstance allegation, we discern no prejudice to defendant based on counsel's  
performance. [Citation]

13 Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 58-59.

14 The state court was not unreasonable in rejecting the claim. Petitioner does not make an  
15 evidentiary showing identifying how and why unpublished interview information sought from  
16 Trihey differed from that in the record and would likely change the result in his proceeding. The  
17 state court, having found that impeachment of Trihey was not in issue, Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th 52,  
18 and giving only minimal weight to Trihey's testimony of a robbery motive, could reasonably  
19 have rejected Petitioner's speculation and desire to impeach himself by arguing that the  
20 interviews did not support the articles.

21 “[C]ounsel has a duty to make reasonable investigations or to make a reasonable decision  
22 that makes particular investigations unnecessary.” Strickland, 466 U.S. at 691. “In any  
23 ineffectiveness case, a particular decision not to investigate must be directly assessed for  
24 reasonableness in all the circumstances, applying a heavy measure of deference to counsel's  
25 judgments.” Id. at 691.

26 Petitioners claim fails under this standard. The trial judge was able to evaluate Trihey's  
27 credibility and motivations in testifying, expressly found that impeachment of Trihey was not in  
28

1 issue. (RT 59.) Toton was afforded the opportunity to cross-examine Trihey, both about  
2 Petitioner's statements and any inconsistency therein (RT 51, 54-57), as well published  
3 statements by Hernandez and by Seeley which alleged were attributed to Petitioner. (RT 51-53.)

4 The record does not support claimed denial of confrontation and fair trial. Any  
5 confrontation clause error was harmless, for reasons discussed in claims 1-4 there was substantial  
6 evidence of guilt even without Trihey's testimony.

7 The trial court verdict accorded only slight evidentiary value to Trihey's testimony.  
8 Defense counsel Toton successfully argued to minimize the significance of Trihey's testimony  
9 regarding robbery motive. (RT 175-183, 235-236.) Any claim of due process and compulsory  
10 process error fails because it is not reasonable to believe any evidence suppressed might have  
11 affected the outcome of trial for reasons discussed in claims 1-26.

12 Accordingly, the Court finds that the California Supreme Court's determination of facts  
13 was not unreasonable in light of the evidence, and its rejection of this claim was neither contrary  
14 to, nor an unreasonable application of, United States Supreme Court precedent.

15 Claim 27 is denied.

16 6. Prosecutorial Misconduct in Guilt and Special Circumstances Phase - Claims 28-  
17 33

18 In claims 28 through 33, Petitioner alleges instances of prosecutorial misconduct during  
19 the guilt and special circumstance phase

20 a. **Clearly Established Law**

21 i. Brady

22 The Supreme Court held that if the state fails to disclose exculpatory evidence in  
23 violation of Brady v. Maryland, 373 U.S 83 (1963), the conviction cannot stand if there is a  
24 reasonable probability that the evidence, considered cumulatively, would have produced a  
25 different result at trial. Kyles v. Whitley, 514 U.S. 419, 441 (1995). There are three components  
26 of a Brady violation: (1) the evidence at issue must be favorable to the accused either because it  
27 is exculpatory or because it is impeaching; (2) the evidence must have been suppressed by the  
28

1 State either willfully or inadvertently; and (3) prejudice must have ensued. Banks v. Dretke, 540  
2 U.S. 668, 691 (2004); Strickler v. Greene, 527 U.S. 263, 281–82 (1999). “Such evidence is  
3 material if there is a reasonable probability that, had the evidence been disclosed to the defense,  
4 the result of the proceeding would have been different.” Strickler, 527 U.S. at 280, quoting  
5 United States v. Bagley, 473 U.S. 667, 682 (1985)). “[T]here is never a real Brady violation  
6 unless the nondisclosure was so serious that there is a reasonable probability that the suppressed  
7 evidence would have produced a different verdict.” Strickler, 527 U.S. at 281.

8 The Supreme Court has held that a federal court can grant habeas relief on a  
9 constitutional trial error claim only if the error had a “substantial or injurious effect” on the  
10 verdict. Brech, 507 U.S. at 637. A new trial is warranted only if prosecutorial misconduct  
11 resulted in a fundamental denial of due process. Darden v. Wainwright, 477 U.S. 168, 181  
12 (1986). Where the issue is evenly balanced and the judge has doubts about whether the error had  
13 a “substantial and injurious effect” on the jury’s verdict, then the judge must treat the error as if  
14 it were not harmless. O’Neal v. McAninch, 513 U.S. 432, 435 (1995). In California v. Roy, 519  
15 U.S. 2 (1996), the Supreme Court ruled that the Ninth Circuit’s application of a modified O’Neal  
16 harmless error standard (“the omission is harmless only if review of the facts found by the jury  
17 establishes that the jury necessarily found the omitted element”) was too strict and remanded the  
18 case for further consideration in light of Brech and O’Neal.

19 The Court in Kyles also held that once a habeas petitioner establishes the “reasonable  
20 probability” of a different result, the error cannot subsequently be found harmless under Brech.  
21 Kyles, 514 U.S. at 436.

22       ii.       Due Process

23 A petitioner is entitled to habeas corpus relief if the prosecutor’s misconduct “so infected  
24 the trial with unfairness as to make the resulting conviction a denial of due process.” Donnelly,  
25 416 U.S. at 643. To constitute a due process violation, the prosecutorial misconduct must be “of  
26 sufficient significance to result in the denial of the defendant’s right to a fair trial.” Greer v.  
27 Miller, 483 U.S. 756, 765 (1987) (quoting Bagley, 473 U.S. at 667). “Before a federal court

1 may overturn a conviction resulting from a state trial . . . it must be established not merely that  
2 the [State's action] is undesirable, erroneous, or even 'universally condemned,' but that it  
3 violated some right which was guaranteed to the defendant by the Fourteenth Amendment."  
4 Smith v. Phillips, 455 U.S. 209, 221 (1982) (quoting Cupp v. Naughten, 414 U.S. 141, 146  
5 (1973)).

6 Any claim of prosecutorial misconduct must be reviewed within the context of the entire  
7 trial. Greer, 485 U.S. at 765-66; United States v. Weitzenhoff, 35 F.3d 1275, 1291 (9th Cir.  
8 1994). The court must keep in mind that "[t]he touchstone of due process analysis in cases of  
9 alleged prosecutorial misconduct is the fairness of the trial, not the culpability of the prosecutor"  
10 and "the aim of due process is not punishment of society for the misdeeds of the prosecutor but  
11 avoidance of an unfair trial to the accused." Phillips, 455 U.S. at 219. "Improper argument does  
12 not, per se, violate a defendant's constitutional rights." Thompson v. Borg, 74 F.3d 1571, 1576  
13 (9th Cir. 1996) (quoting Jeffries v. Blodgett, 5 F.3d 1180, 1191 (9th Cir. 1993)). Furthermore,  
14 the Supreme Court has stated:

15  
16 [A]rguments of counsel generally carry less weight with a jury than do  
17 instructions from the court. The former are usually billed in advance to the jury as  
18 matters of argument, not evidence . . . and are likely viewed as the statements of  
19 advocates; the latter, we have often recognized, are viewed as definitive and  
20 binding statements of the law. Arguments of counsel which misstate the law are  
subject to objection and to correction by the court. This is not to say that  
prosecutorial misrepresentations may never have a decisive effect on the jury, but  
only that they are not to be judged as having the same force as an instruction from  
the court. And the arguments of counsel, like the instructions of the court, must be  
judged in the context in which they are made.

21 Boyde v. California, 494 U.S. 370, 384-85 (1990).

22 If prosecutorial misconduct is established, and it was constitutional error, the error must  
23 be evaluated pursuant to the harmless error test set forth in Brecht. See Thompson, 74 F.3d at  
24 1577 ("Only if the argument were constitutional error would we have to decide whether the  
25 constitutional error was harmless.").

26 **b. Review of Claim 28**

27 In this claim, Petitioner alleges that information tending to undermine the credibility of  
28

1 jailhouse informant Hernandez, that Hernandez was a heroin addict who gave testimony  
2 motivated by Detective Stratton's offer of a deal over pending heroin and probation violation  
3 charges and to avoid being suspected in the Bocanegra murders, was withheld by the  
4 prosecution.

5 The California Supreme Court summarily denied claim 28 (SPet. Claims U) raised in  
6 Petitioner's state petition for habeas corpus. In re Sanchez, S049502 (DD). As noted, in such a  
7 case "the habeas petitioner's burden still must be met by showing there was no reasonable basis  
8 for the state court to deny relief," Richter, 562 U.S. at 98, and this Court "must determine what  
9 arguments or theories supported or . . . *could have supported*, the state court's decision; and then  
10 it must ask whether it is possible fair-minded jurists could disagree that those arguments or  
11 theories are inconsistent with the holding in a prior decision of this Court." Id. (emphasis  
12 added).

13 Here the state court could reasonably have found that Petitioner was not prejudiced by  
14 alleged prosecution failure to disclose information about jailhouse informant Hernandez. The  
15 record in this matter shows that the defense had the benefit of Hernandez's arrest report and  
16 presumptively was aware of his criminal record including any matters relating to substance  
17 abuse. (SPet. Ex. 409, pp. 1-2.) The defense was aware of Hernandez plea deal and cross-  
18 examined Hernandez regarding it. (CT 576-577; RT 2850-51.) Facts surrounding Hernandez  
19 alleged heroin addiction were equally available to defense counsel through discovery. (CT 654-  
20 676.) See U.S. v. Pelullo, 399 F.3d 197, 202 (3d. Cir. 2005) (Brady challenge fails where  
21 information equally available). For the same reason, any alleged omission of Hernandez's  
22 probation status regarding charges plea bargained is unavailing.

23 Petitioner has not made any sufficient showing in the evidentiary record that Hernandez  
24 testified falsely by omitting charges covered by plea bargain. These "omitted" charges were  
25 resolved outside the plea bargain under which Hernandez testified. (SPet. Ex. 508, p. 6.)  
26 Contrary to Petitioner's assertion, the record reflects that it was Hernandez who initiated contact  
27 with the authorities. (RT 2857; CT 576-77; SResp. Ex. C, pp. 1-2.) Petitioner's allegation that  
28

1 Hernandez's testimony was coerced by detective Stratton, and false, fails substantively for  
2 reasons discussed in claims 1-4, *ante*. As discussed in those claims, Hernandez testimony was  
3 not inconsistent with the physical evidence. (CT 355, 378-80.) See United States v. Cooper,  
4 173 F.3d 1192, 1202 (9th Cir. 1999) (stating that to show Brady error, the petitioner must show  
5 that the evidence (1) was exculpatory, (2) should have been but was not produced, and (3) was  
6 material to guilt or innocence). Hernandez's unsigned declaration (SPet. Ex. 101, Att. A) is not  
7 evidence otherwise. 28 U.S.C. § 1746.

8 Given the foregoing and the extended cross-examination of Hernandez by Toton and the  
9 consistent physical evidence, the state court could reasonably have found it unlikely that  
10 allegedly undisclosed evidence would have affected assessment of witness' credibility and, given  
11 Petitioner desire to plead guilty, the result of the proceedings.

12 Respondent contends claim 28 is not cognizable because it creates and retroactively  
13 applies a "new rule" of constitutional law within Teague v. Lane, 489 U.S. 288. However, the  
14 Court finds the claim fails not because Petitioner seeks to apply a new rule of criminal procedure  
15 under Teague, but rather on grounds the claim lacks merit for the reasons stated.

16 For the reasons stated, a fair-minded jurist could have found that the state court rejection  
17 of the claim was neither contrary to, or an unreasonable application of, clearly established federal  
18 law, as determined by the Supreme Court, nor an unreasonable determination of the facts in light  
19 of the evidence presented in the state court proceeding. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

20 Claim 28 is denied.

21 **c. Review of Claim 29**

22 In this next claim, Petitioner alleges that Hernandez's notes of conversation with  
23 Petitioner, which might have provided a basis to impeach Hernandez, were not safeguarded by  
24 police and the prosecution and were lost.

25 The California Supreme Court summarily denied claim 29 (SPet. Claims V) raised in  
26 Petitioner's state petition for habeas corpus. In re Sanchez, S049502 (DD). In such a case, "the  
27 habeas petitioner's burden still must be met by showing there was no reasonable basis for the  
28

1 state court to deny relief," Richter, 562 U.S. at 98, and this Court "must determine what  
2 arguments or theories supported or . . . *could have supported*, the state court's decision; and then  
3 it must ask whether it is possible fair-minded jurists could disagree that those arguments or  
4 theories are inconsistent with the holding in a prior decision of this Court." Id. (emphasis  
5 added).

6 According to the court in Arizona v. Youngblood, 488 U.S. 51, 57 (1988) the failure of a  
7 state to preserve evidence "of which no more can be said than it could have been subjected to  
8 tests, the results of which might have exonerated the defendant," is not a denial of due process of  
9 the law "unless a criminal defendant can show bad faith on the part of the police."

10 The Ninth Circuit used the Youngblood standard for a claim of bad faith destruction of  
11 evidence in U.S. v. Hernandez, 109 F.3d 1450, 1455 (9th Cir. 1997), stating "[t]he mere failure  
12 to preserve evidence which could have been subjected to tests which might have exonerated the  
13 defendant does not constitute a due process violation", citing Mitchell v. Goldsmith, 878 F.2d  
14 319, 322 (9th Cir. 1989).

15 Where the government fails to preserve evidence that is only potentially exculpatory, the  
16 right to due process is violated only if [the evidence] possesses "an exculpatory value that was  
17 apparent before the evidence was destroyed, and [is] of such a nature that the defendant would be  
18 unable to obtain comparable evidence by other reasonably available means." California v.  
19 Trombetta, 467 U.S. 479, 489 (1984).

20 The state court could reasonably have found there was no bad faith failure to preserve  
21 potentially useful evidence. The record does not readily suggest Hernandez made the notes for  
22 the prosecution or as their agent, (CT 74, 477-499, 503, 575-577; SResp. Ex. C, pp. 1, 3), or  
23 prosecutorial bad faith in failing to take custody of and preserve potentially material evidence.  
24 Youngblood, 488 U.S. at 58. Additionally, Petitioner has not demonstrated that the materiality  
25 and exculpatory value of such notes was anything more than speculative. (CT 484-487, 503;  
26 SResp. Ex. C, p. 3.)

27 Respondent contends claim 29 is not cognizable because it creates and retroactively  
28

1 applies a “new rule” of constitutional law within Teague v. Lane, 489 U.S. 288. However, the  
2 Court finds the claim fails not because Petitioner seeks to apply a new rule of criminal procedure  
3 under Teague, but rather on grounds the claim lacks merit for the reasons stated.

4 For the reasons stated, a fair-minded jurist could have found that the state court rejection  
5 of the claim was neither contrary to, or an unreasonable application of, clearly established federal  
6 law, as determined by the Supreme Court, nor an unreasonable determination of the facts in light  
7 of the evidence presented in the state court proceeding. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

8 Claim 29 is denied

9 **d. Review of Claim 30**

10 Petitioner next claims that criminalist Laskowski, who testified to two different sets of  
11 footprints during Petitioner’s proceeding, subsequently identified a third set during Reyes’s  
12 separate trial for his role in the Bocanegra murders, undermining the prosecution’s argument at  
13 Petitioner’s trial that Petitioner and Joey were the only two who struck blows to the victims.

14 The State Supreme Court reviewed this claim in Petitioner state petition for habeas  
15 corpus (SPet. Claim X) and summarily denied it. In re Sanchez, S049502 (DD). In such a case,  
16 “the habeas petitioner’s burden still must be met by showing there was no reasonable basis for  
17 the state court to deny relief,” Richter, 562 U.S. at 98, and this Court “must determine what  
18 arguments or theories supported or . . . could have supported, the state court’s decision; and then  
19 it must ask whether it is possible fair-minded jurists could disagree that those arguments or  
20 theories are inconsistent with the holding in a prior decision of this Court.” Id. (emphasis  
21 added).

22 The knowing use of false or perjured testimony against a defendant to obtain a conviction  
23 is unconstitutional. Napue v. Illinois, 360 U.S. 264 (1959). In Napue, the Supreme Court held  
24 that the knowing use of false testimony to obtain a conviction violates due process regardless of  
25 whether the prosecutor solicited the false testimony or merely allowed it to go uncorrected when  
26 it appeared. Id. at 269. The Court explained that the principle that a State may not knowingly  
27 use false testimony to obtain a conviction - even false testimony that goes only to the credibility  
28

1 of the witness - is “implicit in any concept of ordered liberty.” Id.

2       A conviction obtained by the knowing use of perjured testimony “must be set aside if  
3 there is any reasonable likelihood that the false testimony could have affected the judgment of  
4 the jury.” Bagley, 473 U.S. at 678. Nevertheless, simple inconsistencies in testimony are  
5 insufficient to establish that a prosecutor knowingly permitted the admission of false testimony.  
6 United States v. Zuno-Arce, 44 F.3d 1420, 1423 (9th Cir. 1995). “Discrepancies in . . .  
7 testimony . . . could as easily flow from errors in recollection as from lies.” Id.

8       To warrant habeas relief, Petitioner must establish that: 1) The testimony was actually  
9 false; 2) The prosecution knew or should have known it to be false; and 3) There is a reasonable  
10 likelihood that the false testimony could have affected the jury’s verdict. Tayborn v. Scott, 251  
11 F.3d 1125, 1130 (7th Cir. 2001).

12       There is no sufficient showing Petitioner was prejudiced by presenting the testimony of  
13 criminologist Laskowski regarding the shoe tread pattern photographs taken at the Bocanegra  
14 crime scene. The state court could reasonably have found that, during Petitioner’s trial,  
15 Laskowski and prosecutor Ryals were unaware of a third set of different footprints in the  
16 Bocanegra home. (CT 376; SResp. Ex. B.) Moreover, there is not a reasonable possibility that  
17 testimony of a third set of footprints would have affected the outcome of Petitioner’s trial. See  
18 U.S. v. Agurs, 427 U.S. 97, 103 (1976). Reyes admitted he served as lookout and entered the  
19 home after the murders to assist Joey and Petitioner. (SResp. Ex. A, pp.3-4; see claim 10, *ante*.)  
20 His bloody palm print was in evidence. (CT 202-203.)

21       Any attempt by defense counsel to argue that Reyes rather than Petitioner struck blows to  
22 the victims is rebutted by the record (CT 77-78, 479-84, 487-89, 495, 500-05; RT 181; SPet.  
23 Exhs. 700-701) and Petitioner’s express desire to plead guilty. (SPet. Ex. 520, p. 2; see CT 891-  
24 92; RT [5/16/88] 7; RT-108a-155a.) Petitioner’s statements that he assisted Joey in murdering  
25 Mr. Bocanegra and Mrs. Bocanegra combined with Petitioner’s desire to plead guilty suggests no  
26 reasonable likelihood of a different result had evidence of a third footprint been presented. The  
27 state record in this matter does not demonstrate that Reyes guilty plea was prompted by  
28

1 discovery of the third shoe print. (SPet. Ex. 139, p. 2.)

2 Petitioner fails to demonstrate that no reasonable jurist could have found that he failed to  
3 make a *prima facie* case that the prosecution knowingly used false or perjured evidence with  
4 respect to Laskowski's testimony.

5 Respondent contends claim 30 is not cognizable because it creates and retroactively  
6 applies a "new rule" of constitutional law within Teague v. Lane, 489 U.S. 288. However, the  
7 Court finds the claim fails not because Petitioner seeks to apply a new rule of criminal procedure  
8 under Teague, but rather on grounds the claim lacks merit for the reasons stated.

9 For the reasons stated, a fair-minded jurist could have found that the state court rejection  
10 of these claims was neither contrary to, or an unreasonable application of, clearly established  
11 federal law, as determined by the Supreme Court, nor an unreasonable determination of the facts  
12 in light of the evidence presented in the state court proceeding. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

13 Claim 30 is denied.

14 **e. Review of Claim 31**

15 Petitioner alleges in this claim that pathologist Holloway's testimony was untruthful  
16 because Dr. Holloway stated at the preliminary hearing that victims' scalp wounds were  
17 "entirely" consistent with one weapon wielded by one person, but later stated at the penalty  
18 phase he found only "partial" consistency in these matters.

19 The State Supreme Court reviewed this claim in Petitioner state petition for habeas  
20 corpus and alternatively denied it on the merits and as procedurally barred. In re Sanchez,  
21 S049502 (DD). In such a case, "the habeas petitioner's burden still must be met by showing  
22 there was no reasonable basis for the state court to deny relief," Richter, 562 U.S. at 98, and this  
23 Court "must determine what arguments or theories supported or . . . could have supported, the  
24 state court's decision; and then it must ask whether it is possible fair-minded jurists could  
25 disagree that those arguments or theories are inconsistent with the holding in a prior decision of  
26 this Court." Id. (emphasis added).

27 Petitioner cites to facts alleged in claim 10, *ante*. He argues that had Holloway testified  
28

1 truthfully at the preliminary hearing, a three assailant theory might have discredited Hernandez's  
2 testimony that only two assailants struck blows to the victims. However, the Court is not  
3 convinced that Dr. Holloway's erroneous testimony precluded a theory that more than one  
4 perpetrator and more than one weapon inflicted the scalp wounds on Mr. Bocanegra and Mrs.  
5 Bocanegra; Toton argued as much. (RT 187-191.)

6 Dr. Holloway testified at the preliminary hearing that Mr. Bocanegra's head wounds were  
7 entirely consistent with being inflicted by one person (CT 118-119, 134), similar to Mrs.  
8 Bocanegra's head wounds (CT 118, 155-156, 159), and were consistent with being inflicted by  
9 the same type of instrument (CT 118-119), though not necessarily the identical instrument. (CT  
10 131-134.)

11 Dr. Holloway later testified at the penalty phase that he had erred, that Mr. Bocanegra's  
12 head wounds were not entirely consistent with Mrs. Bocanegra's (RT 2704-2706, 2720-2721,  
13 2725), that is they were only partially consistent (RT 2721-2722, 2725), and that he could not  
14 conclude from the autopsy evidence how many assailants were involved in the attack on Mr.  
15 Bocanegra and Mrs. Bocanegra. (SPet. Ex. 120, p.3.)

16 Even so, the state court could reasonably have found that Holloway and prosecutor Ryals  
17 were not aware of the error at the preliminary hearing. (SResp. Ex. B.)

18 There is no sufficient showing Petitioner was prejudiced by pathologist Holloway's  
19 erroneous interpretation of scalp wounds of Mr. Bocanegra and Mrs. Bocanegra. The state court  
20 could reasonably have found that Holloway's erroneous testimony that Mr. Bocanegra's scalp  
21 wounds were "entirely" consistent with Mrs. Bocanegra's did not affect the outcome of  
22 Petitioner's trial. See Agurs, 427 U.S. at 103. Holloway's preliminary hearing opinion qualified  
23 that the scalp wounds were not necessarily caused by the "the identical instrument" (CT 132) and  
24 were consistent with being inflicted by one person (CT 134). Holloway's testimony did not  
25 reasonably preclude Toton from arguing use of more than one weapon by more than one  
26 perpetrator. (RT 189-191). Moreover, had Dr. Holloway's modified testimony been presented  
27 at the preliminary hearing the outcome would not likely have changed for reasons stated in  
28

1 claims 1, 3, and 10.

2 Any attempt by defense counsel to argue Reyes rather than Petitioner struck blows to the  
3 victims is rebutted by the record (CT 77-78, 479-84, 487-89, 495, 500-505; RT 181; SPet. Exhs.  
4 700-701) and Petitioner's expressed desire to plead guilty. (SPet. Ex. 520, p. 2; CT 891-92; RT  
5 [5/16/88] 7; RT- 108a-155a.) A mere inconsistency in testimony does not establish that a  
6 prosecutor knowingly permitted the admission of false testimony. Zuno-Arce, 44 F.3d at 1423.  
7 Holloway's erroneous preliminary hearing testimony was corrected at the penalty phase. (SPet.  
8 Ex. 120, p. 3.)

9 Respondent contends claim 31 is not cognizable because it creates and retroactively  
10 applies a "new rule" of constitutional law within Teague v. Lane, 489 U.S. 288. However, the  
11 Court finds the claim fails not because Petitioner seeks to apply a new rule of criminal procedure  
12 under Teague, but rather on grounds the claim lacks merit for the reasons stated.

13 For the reasons stated, a fair-minded jurist could have found that the state court rejection  
14 of the claim was neither contrary to, or an unreasonable application of, clearly established federal  
15 law, as determined by the Supreme Court, nor an unreasonable determination of the facts in light  
16 of the evidence presented in the state court proceeding. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

17 Claim 31 is denied.

18 **f. Review of Claim 32**

19 Petitioner claims here that prosecutor Ryals' falsely argued the two assailant theory when  
20 the evidence (i.e., the third set of footprints and a bloody palm print on the doorknob and  
21 information from Seeley) supported Reyes's presence in the Bocanegra home.

22 This claim was reached and summarily denied in Petitioner's state petition for habeas  
23 corpus (SPet. Claim Z). In re Sanchez, S049502 (DD). In such a case, "the habeas petitioner's  
24 burden still must be met by showing there was no reasonable basis for the state court to deny  
25 relief," Richter, 562 U.S. at 98, and this Court "must determine what arguments or theories  
26 supported or . . . could have supported, the state court's decision; and then it must ask whether it  
27 is possible fair-minded jurists could disagree that those arguments or theories are inconsistent

1 with the holding in a prior decision of this Court.” Id. (emphasis added).

2       The California Supreme Court declined to reach the claim that Prosecutor Ryals  
3 committed such prejudicial misconduct in her guilt phase closing argument because the asserted  
4 evidence of misconduct, allegedly contrary statements by prosecutor Ryals to the court during  
5 subsequent, separate pretrial hearings in the prosecution of Reyes, were not within the appellate  
6 record or matters judicially noticed. This Court cannot consider evidence outside the state  
7 record. Pinholster, 131 S. Ct. at 1398. Even if it could, evidence proffered in the Reyes  
8 proceeding was not necessarily inconsistent with the prosecution’s two assailant theory in this  
9 action. See People v. Robert Gabriel Reyes, Kern County Superior Court case number 34638,  
10 RT [10/3/91] 2-3, SResp. Ex. A.

11       The state court could reasonably have determined that Petitioner was not prejudiced by  
12 the prosecution’s two assailant argument for reasons discussed in claims 1-4 and 28-31. The  
13 prosecution could rely upon inference from trial court evidence that supported the two person  
14 theory, i.e., that only Joey and Petitioner were in the Bocanegra home at the time of the murders.  
15 Notably, Petitioner did not challenge the evidence demonstrating that he struck Mr. Bocanegra  
16 (CT 481-82; RT 169, 184-185, 188, 196; RT 207) and that he grabbed Mrs. Bocanegra and told  
17 Joey to “shut her up” (CT 482-83, 504; RT 190-191). Evidence that, at some point, Reyes was  
18 present in the house does not necessarily establish his participation in the murders. (See CT 202-  
19 203.)

20       Additionally, no theory inconsistent with the two assailant theory was advanced in  
21 Reyes’s separate criminal proceedings. Reyes pled guilty in his criminal proceeding on the  
22 theory he participated in the Bocanegra murders only by acting as a lookout during the murders  
23 and then assisting Joey and Petitioner after the murders. See People v. Robert Gabriel Reyes,  
24 Kern County Superior Court Case No. 34638, RT [10/3/91] 2-3; SResp. Ex. A. Even if there  
25 were inconsistencies in testimony regarding the Reyes involvement in the Bocanegra murders,  
26 inconsistencies alone are not sufficient to establish that the prosecutor knowingly permitted the  
27 admission of false testimony. Zuno-Arce, 44 F.3d at 1423.

28

1 The Court does not find that Petitioner’s trial was fundamentally unfair. The two  
2 assailant theory was consistent with the evidence at the guilt and special circumstance phase and  
3 inference therefrom and was not objected to by Toton. (RT 147-149, 191, 211-12; claims 1, 3,  
4 10.) See Donnelly, 416 U.S. at 647-48 (1974) (improper jury argument by the state does not  
5 present a claim of constitutional magnitude unless it is so prejudicial that the petitioner’s trial  
6 was fundamentally unfair . . . [t]o establish prejudice, the petitioner must demonstrate either  
7 persistent and pronounced misconduct or that the evidence was so insubstantial that, in all  
8 probability, but for the remarks, no conviction would have occurred); see also Darden, 477 U.S.  
9 at 182 (claim of prosecutorial misconduct rejected where the prosecutor’s comments “did not  
10 manipulate or misstate the evidence, nor . . . implicate other specific rights of the accused, such  
11 as the right to counsel or to remain silent.”). For the reasons stated in claims 1-4, the weight of  
12 evidence against Petitioner was not insubstantial.

13        Respondent also contends claim 32 is not cognizable because it creates and retroactively  
14 applies a “new rule” of constitutional law within Teague v. Lane, 489 U.S. 288. However, the  
15 Court finds the claim fails not because Petitioner seeks to apply a new rule of criminal procedure  
16 under Teague, but rather on grounds the claim lacks merit for the reasons stated.

17 Accordingly, a fair-minded jurist could have found that the state court rejection of the  
18 claim was neither contrary to, or an unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law,  
19 as determined by the Supreme Court, nor an unreasonable determination of the facts in light of  
20 the evidence presented in the state court proceeding. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

**g. Review of Claim 33**

22 In this next claim, Petitioner alleges cumulative error from prosecutorial misconduct.

23 This claim was reached and summarily denied in Petitioner’s state petition for habeas  
24 corpus (SPet. Claim AA). In re Sanchez, S049502 (DD). In such a case, “the habeas petitioner’s  
25 burden still must be met by showing there was no reasonable basis for the state court to deny  
26 relief,” Richter, 562 U.S. at 98, and this Court “must determine what arguments or theories  
27 supported or . . . *could have supported*, the state court’s decision; and then it must ask whether it

1 is possible fair-minded jurists could disagree that those arguments or theories are inconsistent  
2 with the holding in a prior decision of this Court.” Id. (emphasis added).

3 Petitioner cites to facts alleged in claims 28-32, *ante*, in support of this claim. However,  
4 the Court finds Petitioner has not made a sufficient showing of prejudiced by cumulative error  
5 from prosecutorial misconduct. The state court could reasonably have found that Petitioner  
6 failed to establish prosecutorial misconduct causing him prejudice for the reasons discussed  
7 above in claims 28-32. These claims are insubstantial when considered cumulatively. See  
8 Karterman, 60 F.3d at 580; see also Rupe, 93 F.3d at 1445. Petitioner has not then established a  
9 reasonable probability that the evidence of alleged prosecutorial error, considered cumulatively,  
10 would have produced a different result at trial.

11 Respondent contends claim 33 is not cognizable because it creates and retroactively  
12 applies a “new rule” of constitutional law within Teague v. Lane, 489 U.S. 288. However, the  
13 Court finds the claim fails not because Petitioner seeks to apply a new rule of criminal procedure  
14 under Teague, but rather on grounds the claim lacks merit for the reasons stated.

15 Accordingly, for the reasons stated, a fair-minded jurist could have found that the state  
16 court rejection of the claim was neither contrary to, or an unreasonable application of, clearly  
17 established federal law, as determined by the Supreme Court, nor an unreasonable determination  
18 of the facts in light of the evidence presented in the state court proceeding. See 28 U.S.C. §  
19 2254(d).

20 Claim 33 is denied.

21 7. Cumulative Error in Guilt and Special Circumstance Phase – Claim 34

22 a. **Clearly Established Law**

23 The applicable legal standard is set forth above, in the Court’s analysis of claim 18.

24 b. **Review of Claim 34**

25 In this next claim, Petitioner alleges that constitutional violations during the guilt and  
26 special circumstance phase, claims 1 through 33, *ante*, when considered together and taken as a  
27 whole, prejudicially caused an unfair guilt trial, in violation of the Fifth, Sixth, Eighth and  
28

1 Fourteenth Amendments.

2 The California Supreme Court summarily denied claim 34 (SPet. Claim BB) raised in  
3 Petitioner's state petition for habeas corpus. In re Sanchez, S049502 (DD).

4 The state supreme court also considered this claim on appeal and rejected it noting:

5 Defendant contends his conviction should be reversed because of the cumulative  
6 effect of the alleged guilt phase errors. He relies on the California Constitution,  
7 article I, section 15, and the Sixth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United  
States Constitution.

8 Contrary to defendant's contention, however, he has not sustained any of his  
9 claims of error. Accordingly, we find no cumulative deficiency in the guilt  
phase proceedings to support reversal. [Citation]

10 Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th, at 60.

11 Where none of the alleged claims state a violation of constitutional law, there is no reason  
12 to grant habeas relief based on cumulative error. Rupe, 93 F.3d at 1445. For the reasons stated  
13 in claims 1-33 above, this Court finds claim 34 fails substantively for reasons discussed in claims  
14 1-33.

15 Respondent also contends claim 34 is not cognizable because it creates and retroactively  
16 applies a "new rule" of constitutional law within Teague v. Lane, 489 U.S. 288. However, the  
17 Court finds the claim fails not because Petitioner seeks to apply a new rule of criminal procedure  
18 under Teague, but rather on grounds the claim lacks merit for the reasons stated.

19 Accordingly, the state court rejection of claim 34 was not contrary to, or an unreasonable  
20 application of, clearly established federal law, as determined by the Supreme Court. Nor was the  
21 state court's ruling based on an unreasonable determination of the facts in light of the evidence  
22 presented in the state court proceeding. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

23 Claim 34 is denied.

24 8. State Appellate Review of Guilt and Special Circumstance Phase – Claim 35

25 a. **Clearly Established Law**

26 A habeas petition must allege that the petitioner's detention violates the Constitution, a  
27 federal statute, or a treaty. 28 U.S.C. § 2241(c)(3); Rose v. Hodges, 423 U.S. 19, 21 (1975). No

1 constitutional provision or federal law entitles Petitioner to any state collateral review.  
2 Pennsylvania v. Finley, 481 U.S. 551, 557 (1987). As the Ninth Circuit and nearly all other  
3 circuit courts have found, “federal habeas relief is not available to redress alleged procedural  
4 errors in state post-conviction proceedings.” Ortiz v. Stewart, 149 F.3d 923, 939 (9th Cir. 1998);  
5 Franzen v. Brinkman, 877 F.2d 26 (9th Cir. 1989) (“a petition alleging errors in the state post-  
6 conviction review process is not addressable through habeas corpus proceedings”); Williams v.  
7 State of Mo., 640 F.2d 140, 143 (8th Cir. 1981) (infirmities in the state's post-conviction remedy  
8 procedure cannot serve as a basis for setting aside a valid original conviction); Hassine v.  
9 Zimmerman, 160 F.3d 941, 954 (3d Cir. 1998) (“[T]he federal role in reviewing an application  
10 for habeas corpus is limited to evaluating what occurred in the state or federal proceedings that  
11 actually led to the petitioner's conviction; what occurred in the petitioner's collateral proceeding  
12 does not enter into a habeas calculation.”); Morris v. Cain, 186 F.3d 581, 585 n.6 (5th Cir. 1999)  
13 (finding that “errors in state post-conviction proceedings will not, in and of themselves, entitle a  
14 petitioner to federal habeas relief”); Bryant v. Maryland, 848 F.2d 492, 493 (4th Cir. 1988)  
15 (“claims of error occurring in a state post-conviction proceeding cannot serve as a basis for  
16 federal habeas corpus relief”); Millard v. Lynaugh, 810 F.2d 1403, 1410 (5th Cir. 1987); Kirby  
17 v. Dutton, 794 F.2d 245, 247-48 (6th Cir. 1986); Spradley v. Dugger, 825 F.2d 1566, 1568 (11th  
18 Cir. 1987).

19 The Supreme Court has stated that “when a State chooses to offer help to those seeking  
20 relief from convictions,” due process does not “dictat[e] the exact form such assistance must  
21 assume.” Finley, 481 U.S. at 559. Since the petitioner has already been found guilty at a fair  
22 trial, he has only a limited due process interest in post-conviction relief. Dist. Attorney's Office  
23 for Third Judicial Dist. v. Osborne, 557 U.S. 52, 69 (2009). “[T]he question is whether  
24 consideration of [defendant's] claim within the framework of the State's procedures for post-  
25 conviction relief “offends some principle of justice so rooted in the traditions and conscience of  
26 our people as to be ranked as fundamental,” or “transgresses any recognized principle of  
27 fundamental fairness in operation.” Id. (quoting Medina v. California, 505 U.S. 437, 446, 448  
28

1 (1992). “Federal courts may upset a State's post-conviction relief procedures only if they are  
2 fundamentally inadequate to vindicate the substantive rights provided.” Id.

3 Accordingly, a claim challenging the adequacy of state appellate review is not cognizable  
4 on federal habeas. Under well-established principles of law and comity, a federal court has no  
5 jurisdiction over state courts to assess the adequacy or competence of their review since appellate  
6 review is not constitutionally required. Evitts v. Lucey, 469 U.S. 387, 393 (1985) (citing  
7 McKane v. Durston, 153 U.S. 684 (1894)); see also Franzen v. Brinkman, 877 F.2d 26 (9th Cir.  
8 1989) (federal habeas court may not review a petition alleging errors in the state post-conviction  
9 review process). The federal constitution only requires that an appellate forum be accessible and  
10 available to all, regardless of economic status, once a state establishes a right to appeal. Lucey,  
11 469 U.S. at 393-94.

12 **b. Review of Claim 35**

13 Petitioner alleges in this claim that the California Supreme Court affirmed his conviction  
14 and sentence on the basis of material misstatements and omissions of issues and facts, and then  
15 denied rehearing, violating his Fifth, Sixth, Eighth and Fourteenth Amendment rights.

16 The state supreme court considered this claim in the petition for rehearing. That court  
17 issued a modification opinion upon denial of rehearing (see 12 Cal. 4th 825b), corrected errors  
18 and withdrew the “Alleged Prosecutorial Misconduct” section of its opinion.

19 Petitioner alleges that the state supreme court erred by not re-assessing or re-analyzing  
20 legal issues in light of the modification.

21 Appellate review of California's capital cases is authorized by California Penal Code  
22 sections 190.4(e) and 1239(b). At the time of Petitioner's trial, section 1239(b) provided,  
23 “[w]hen upon any plea a judgment of death is rendered, an appeal is automatically taken by the  
24 defendant without any action by him or his counsel.” Even where defendant's counsel takes no  
25 action, California's high court has a duty to examine the complete trial record to “ascertain[]  
26 whether defendant was given a fair trial.” People v. Perry, 14 Cal. 2d 387, 392 (1939).

27 Section 190.4 provides an automatic application for modification of a verdict imposing  
28

1 the death penalty, by which the trial judge reviews the evidence and reweights the section 190.3  
2 aggravating and mitigating circumstances before imposing sentence based on the jury's verdict.  
3 Denial of modification of a verdict of death is reviewed on the automatic appeal pursuant to  
4 section 1293(b). Such review includes the "evidence relied on by the [trial] judge." Pulley, 465  
5 U.S. at 53 (quoting People v. Frierson, 25 Cal. 3d 142, 179 (1979)) ("the statutory requirements  
6 that the jury specify the special circumstances which permit imposition of the death penalty, and  
7 that the trial judge specify the reasons for denying the modification of the death penalty, serve to  
8 assure thoughtful and effective appellate review, focusing upon the circumstances present in  
9 each particular case.").

10 Aside from the state statutory duty to examine the complete trial record for fairness and  
11 the federal constitutional requirement that an appeal be available to indigent appellants, there are  
12 no obligations placed on the California Supreme Court that could cause a violation of an  
13 appellant's federal constitutional rights. Sections 190.4(e) and 1239(b), and the cases construing  
14 them, provide the mechanism for meaningful appellate review.

15 Petitioner alleges misstatements regarding the Bocanegra murders; misstatements and  
16 omissions regarding disciplinary proceedings against Toton; misstatements and omissions  
17 regarding reporter immunity under California Shield Law; misstatements regarding alleged  
18 prosecutorial misconduct; and other misstatements and omissions. Nonetheless, the state  
19 supreme court's affirmation was based on its modified opinion. Reasonably implicit in the  
20 modified opinion is that court's re-examination of the issues underlying its issuance of the  
21 modified opinion.

22 Additionally, Petitioner has not made a showing on the evidentiary record that the  
23 modified opinion contained any misstatements or omission. In that no material misstatements or  
24 omissions are identified in the modified opinion, and given that court's adjudication of all  
25 Plaintiff's claims on the merits, this Court cannot find the state supreme court's determination of  
26 facts to be unreasonable or unfair on the record before it.

27 Respondent contends claim 35 is not cognizable because it creates and retroactively  
28

1 applies a “new rule” of constitutional law within Teague v. Lane, 489 U.S. 288. However, the  
2 Court finds the claim fails not because Petitioner seeks to apply a new rule of criminal procedure  
3 under Teague, but rather on grounds the claim lacks merit for the reasons stated.

4 Accordingly, the state court rejection of claim 35 was not contrary to, or an unreasonable  
5 application of, clearly established federal law, as determined by the Supreme Court. Nor was the  
6 state court's ruling based on an unreasonable determination of the facts in light of the evidence  
7 presented in the state court proceeding. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

8 Claim 35 is denied.

9 9. Constitutionality of California Death Penalty – Claim 36

10 a. **Clearly Established Law**

11 Supreme Court cases have established that a state capital sentencing system must: “(1)  
12 rationally narrow the class of death-eligible defendants; and (2) permit a jury to render a  
13 reasoned, individualized sentencing determination based on a death-eligible defendant's record,  
14 personal characteristics, and the circumstances of his crime.” Kansas v. Marsh, 548 U.S. 163,  
15 173-74 (2006). If the “state system satisfies these requirements,” then the “State enjoys a range  
16 of discretion in imposing the death penalty, including the manner in which aggravating and  
17 mitigating circumstances are to be weighed.” Id. (citing Franklin v. Lynaugh, 487 U.S. 164, 179  
18 (1988) and Zant v. Stephens, 462 U.S. 862, 875–876, n.13 (1983)).

19 A state may narrow the class of murderers eligible for the death penalty by defining  
20 degrees of murder. Sawyer v. Whitley, 505 U.S. 333, 342 (1992). A state may further narrow  
21 the class of murderers by finding “beyond a reasonable doubt at least one of a list of statutory  
22 aggravating factors.” Id.; see also Gregg, 428 U.S. at 196-97.

23 b. **Review of Claim 36**

24 In this claim Petitioner alleges that California’s death penalty scheme in effect in 1987  
25 was unconstitutional because it was arbitrary and unpredictable, failing to genuinely narrow class  
26 of murders eligible for the death penalty, violating his Eighth and Fourteenth Amendment rights.

27 The California Supreme Court summarily denied claim 34 (SPet. Claim YY) raised in  
28

1 Petitioner's state petition for habeas corpus. In re Sanchez, S049502 (DD).

2 The state supreme court also considered this claim on appeal, as follows:

3  
4 Defendant contends that the 1978 death penalty law is unconstitutional under the  
5 United States and California Constitutions because it fails to narrow the class of  
6 death-eligible murderers and thus renders "the overwhelming majority of  
7 intentional first degree murderers" death eligible. Defendant cites statistics of all  
8 first degree murder convictions in which a defendant was found death eligible,  
9 and concludes: "The vice of the California scheme is not that any one of the  
10 special circumstances taken alone is unconstitutional-each arguably identifies a  
11 subclass of all first degree murders more deserving of the death penalty than other  
12 members of the class. The vice is that, taken together, the special circumstances  
13 cover virtually all first degree murders (and a substantial majority of all murders),  
14 and, thus, they perform no narrowing function at all." Principally, defendant relies  
15 on Justice Blackman's dissent in Tuilaepa v. California, (1994) 512 U.S. ---, ---  
16 [129 L.Ed.2d 750, 767-774, 114 S. Ct. 2630], in which he stated: "By creating  
nearly 20 such special circumstances, California creates an extraordinarily large  
death pool." Id.

12 We have repeatedly considered and rejected this identical claim beginning with  
13 our decision in People v. Rodriguez (1986) 42 Cal.3d 730, 770-779. [Citation]  
14 Moreover, in Tuilaepa, supra, and in a number of previous cases, the high court  
15 has recognized that "the proper degree of definition" of death-eligibility factors  
16 "is not susceptible of mathematical precision"; the court has confirmed that our  
death penalty law avoids constitutional impediments because it is not  
unnecessarily vague, it suitably narrows the class of death-eligible persons, and  
provides for an individualized penalty determination. [Citation] Defendant's  
argument fails to convince us to revisit the issue. [Citation]

17 Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 60-61. In addition, the state supreme court has further held that:

18  
19 California's scheme for death eligibility satisfies the constitutional requirement  
20 that it "not apply to every defendant convicted of a murder[, but only] to a  
21 subclass of defendants convicted of murder. [Citation.]" Even after 1990 additions  
22 by virtue of Propositions 114 and 115, the special circumstances set forth in the  
statute are not over inclusive by their number or terms. [Citation] Nor have the  
23 statutory categories been construed in an unduly expansive manner. [Citation]  
Having been found guilty of an intentional murder in the course of a robbery,  
defendant falls within the "subclass" of murderers who are eligible for the death  
penalty. [Citation]

24 People v. Arias, 13 Cal.4th 92, 186-87 (1996) (citing Harris, 465 U.S. at 53) (upholding 1977  
25 death penalty law).

26 Petitioner claims most of those who could be convicted of first degree murder are  
27 statutorily eligible for the death penalty, yet only a small portion of murderers who are statutorily

1 eligible for the death penalty are actually sentenced to death.

2       However, in California, a defendant may be sentenced to death for first-degree murder if  
3 the trier of fact finds the defendant guilty and also finds true one or more of [then] 19 special  
4 circumstances listed in Cal. Penal Code § 190.2. As relevant here, one of the circumstances is:  
5 “[t]he defendant, in this proceeding, has been convicted of more than one offense of murder in  
6 the first or second degree.” Cal. Penal Code § 190.2(a)(3). There is no question that this  
7 sentencing scheme satisfies clearly established constitutional requirements. First, the subclass of  
8 defendants eligible for the death penalty is rationally narrowed to those who have committed  
9 multiple murders. Tuilaepa, 512 U.S. at 969-73. The multiple murder special circumstance  
10 sufficiently guides the sentencer and is not unconstitutionally vague. See Godfrey v. Georgia,  
11 446 U.S. 420, 428 (1980) (the sentencer’s discretion must be guided by “clear and objective  
12 standards.”).

13       In California v. Ramos, 463 U.S. 992 (1983), the United States Supreme Court stated that  
14 “[o]nce the jury finds that the defendant falls within the legislatively defined category of persons  
15 eligible for the death penalty” the jury’s consideration of a myriad of factors and exercise of  
16 “unbridled discretion” in determining whether death is the appropriate punishment is not  
17 arbitrary and capricious. Id. at 1008-09. At the selection stage, an individualized determination  
18 includes consideration of the character and record of the defendant, the circumstances of the  
19 crime, and an assessment of the defendant’s culpability. Tuilaepa, 512 U.S. at 972-73.  
20 However, the jury “need not be instructed how to weigh any particular fact in the capital  
21 sentencing decision.” Id. at 979.

22       This Court finds that state supreme court could reasonably have determined that  
23 California’s death penalty scheme in effect in 1987 did not fail to genuinely narrow the class of  
24 murderers eligible for the death penalty. California’s scheme, which narrows the class of death  
25 eligible offenders to less than the definition of first degree murder and permits consideration of  
26 all mitigating evidence, has been approved by the United States Supreme Court, Tuilaepa, 512  
27 U.S. at 972-79; Harris, 465 U.S. at 38, and this Court, see Ben-Sholom v. Woodford, Case No.  
28

1 CV-F-93-5531 (E.D. Cal. October 5, 2001).

2 The state court rejection of this claim was not contrary to, or an unreasonable application  
3 of, clearly established federal law, as determined by the Supreme Court. Nor was the state  
4 court's ruling was based on an unreasonable determination of the facts in light of the evidence  
5 presented in the state court proceeding, viewed most favoring the prosecution, Jackson, 443 U.S.  
6 at 319. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

7 Claim 36 is denied.

8 10. Prosecutorial Misconduct In The Penalty Phase – Claims 37 through 42

9 a. **Clearly Established Law**

10 The legal standard is set out in the preface to claims 28-32.

11 b. **Review of Claim 37**

12 Petitioner next claims prosecutorial misconduct in using, failing to correct and arguing  
13 false evidence by Bakersfield Police Detective Boggs.

14 The California Supreme Court summarily denied claim 37 (SPet. Claim CC) raised in  
15 Petitioner's state petition for habeas corpus. In re Sanchez, S049502 (DD).

16 The California Supreme Court also considered and rejected this claim on appeal, finding  
17 that the defense had waived the issue on appeal, Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th 65-66, and that the record  
18 did not support the claim because it was "simply a disagreement as to the interpretation of the  
19 evidence, and in no way indicates that Ryals encouraged or elicited false testimony from Boggs."  
20 Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 71.

21 As discussed above, the knowing use of false or perjured testimony against a defendant to  
22 obtain a conviction is unconstitutional. Napue v. Illinois, 360 U.S. 264 (1959). In Napue, the  
23 Supreme Court held that the knowing use of false testimony to obtain a conviction violates due  
24 process regardless of whether the prosecutor solicited the false testimony or merely allowed it to  
25 go uncorrected when it appeared. Id. at 269. The high court explained that the principle that a  
26 State may not knowingly use false testimony to obtain a conviction - even false testimony that  
27 goes only to the credibility of the witness - is "implicit in any concept of ordered liberty." Id. A

28

1 conviction obtained by the knowing use of perjured testimony “must be set aside if there is any  
2 reasonable likelihood that the false testimony could have affected the judgment of the jury.”  
3 Bagley, 473 U.S. at 678. Nevertheless, simple inconsistencies in testimony are insufficient to  
4 establish that a prosecutor knowingly permitted the admission of false testimony. Zuno-Arce, 44  
5 F.3d at 1423. “Discrepancies in . . . testimony . . . could as easily flow from errors in  
6 recollection as from lies.” Id. To warrant habeas relief, Petitioner must establish that: 1) the  
7 testimony was actually false; 2) the prosecution knew or should have known it to be false; and 3)  
8 there is a reasonable likelihood that the false testimony could have affected the jury’s verdict.  
9 Tayborn, 251 F.3d at 1130.

10 In this claim, Petitioner alleges that Boggs, testifying at the penalty phase, falsely  
11 attributed to Petitioner a statement actually made by Reyes, that after the Tatman murder he  
12 “kicked back, drank some whiskey, smoked some dope, ate some food, and mostly relaxed for  
13 the rest of the evening.” (RT 2663-2664.) Though Boggs correctly attributed the statement to  
14 Reyes at the preliminary hearing (CT 308), Petitioner contends that prosecutor Ryals did not  
15 correct the false testimony at the penalty phase, instead using it to highlight Petitioner’s lack of  
16 remorse. (RT 2619, 3036.)

17 The evidence before the state court did not reasonably suggest Boggs knowingly testified  
18 falsely, or that Prosecutor Ryals was aware of the errant testimony. (SResp. Ex. B.) Boggs  
19 states in his June 29, 1995 declaration that he mistakenly testified at the penalty phase that  
20 Petitioner, rather than Robert Reyes, stated that:

21  
22 They returned to their own room and just, again in his own words, kicked back,  
23 drank some whiskey, smoked some dope, ate some food, and just relaxed for the  
rest of the evening.

24 SPet. Ex. 100. The state court could reasonably have determined that Prosecutor Ryals did not  
25 know that Boggs’s testimony was erroneous and did not knowingly rely on erroneous testimony.  
26 (SResp. Ex. B.) Petitioner has not pointed to evidence before the state court demonstrating either  
27 Ryals or Boggs was aware of the error in Boggs’s testimony. Defense counsel Toton and Frank,  
28

1 who both were present at the preliminary hearing, were themselves unaware of the erroneous  
2 testimony. (SPet. Exhs. 137, p. 12; 113, p. 10.)

3       Nor does there appear to be a reasonable likelihood the error affected imposition of the  
4 death penalty, see Agurs, 427 U.S. at 103, or made trial so fundamentally unfair as to deny due  
5 process. Donnelly, 416 U.S. at 645. The Court concurs in Respondent's argument that it is  
6 unlikely the erroneous testimony undercut juror sympathy for Petitioner given Petitioner's  
7 confession to Boggs of the circumstances of the Tatman murder, that Petitioner decided to "hit  
8 the old man" and take his food and refrigerator, that he and Reyes entered Mr. Tatman's room,  
9 that Reyes made stabbing motions at Tatman with a screwdriver, and that Petitioner stole Mr.  
10 Tatman's possessions after witnessing his murder. (RT 2658-2666; SPet. Ex. 129, pp. 1-2.)

11       For these reasons, the state court rejection of the claim was not contrary to, or an  
12 unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law, as determined by the Supreme  
13 Court, or based on an unreasonable determination of the facts in light of the evidence presented  
14 in the state court proceeding viewed most favoring the prosecution, Jackson, 443 U.S. at 319.  
15 See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

16       Claim 37 is denied.

17       **c.      Review of Claim 38**

18       Petitioner next claims prosecutorial misconduct in using false evidence at penalty phase  
19 by Criminalist Laskowski. He alleges that Laskowski falsely testified at the penalty phase, as he  
20 did in the guilt and special circumstance phase, that there were only two sets of footprints at the  
21 Bocanegra home after the murders, only later discovering a third set of footprints. Petitioner  
22 further argues that, as at the guilt and special circumstance phase, prosecutor Ryals used a two-  
23 person theory to linking Petitioner to the murders.

24       The California Supreme Court summarily denied claim 38 (SPet. Claim DD) raised in  
25 Petitioner's state petition for habeas corpus. In re Sanchez, S049502 (DD). In such a case, "the  
26 habeas petitioner's burden still must be met by showing there was no reasonable basis for the  
27 state court to deny relief," Richter, 562 U.S. at 98, and this Court "must determine what  
28

1 arguments or theories supported or . . . *could have supported*, the state court's decision; and then  
2 it must ask whether it is possible fair-minded jurists could disagree that those arguments or  
3 theories are inconsistent with the holding in a prior decision of this Court." *Id.* (emphasis  
4 added).

5 Napue established that the knowing use of false or perjured testimony against a defendant  
6 to obtain a conviction is unconstitutional. A conviction obtained by the knowing use of perjured  
7 testimony "must be set aside if there is any reasonable likelihood that the false testimony could  
8 have affected the judgment of the jury." Bagley, 473 U.S. at 678. Nevertheless, simple  
9 inconsistencies in testimony are insufficient to establish that a prosecutor knowingly permitted  
10 the admission of false testimony. Zuno-Arce, 44 F.3d at 1423. "Discrepancies in . . . testimony .  
11 . . could as easily flow from errors in recollection as from lies." *Id.* To warrant habeas relief,  
12 Petitioner must establish that: 1) the testimony was actually false; 2) the prosecution knew or  
13 should have known it to be false; and 3) there is a reasonable likelihood that the false testimony  
14 could have affected the jury's verdict. Tayborn, 251 F.3d 1125 at 1130.

15 Petitioner cites to facts alleged in claims 30 and 32 in support of this claim. However,  
16 the state court could reasonably have found that the claim lacks merit. At the preliminary  
17 hearing (CT 376) and at the penalty phase of Petitioner's trial (RT 2813), Laskowski testified he  
18 was able to determine from crime scene photographs that there were two types of shoes in the  
19 kitchen. The following year he re-examined the photographs and determined that there were  
20 three types of shoe patterns in the kitchen and outside the Bocanegra home. (SPet. Ex. 121, p. 2;  
21 Ex. 417, pp. 1-2; SHCP Ex. 137, Ex. A.)

22 However, Petitioner does not make an evidentiary showing that either Laskowski or  
23 Ryals knew of the error at the time of the penalty phase. The Court finds that the Claim fails  
24 substantively for reasons stated in Claims 30 and 32, *ante*. The state court could reasonably  
25 conclude that neither Laskowski nor Ryals knew the former's interpretation was erroneous.

26 Nor is there a reasonable likelihood the erroneous testimony affected the jury's  
27 imposition of the death penalty, see Agurs, 427 U.S. at 103, or made trial so fundamentally  
28

1 unfair as to deny due process. Donnelly, 416 U.S. at 645. The evidence against Petitioner was  
2 substantial as discussed in claims 30 and 32.

3 A fair-minded jurist could conclude from the evidence and statements Petitioner made to  
4 Hernandez and Trihey, that Petitioner assisted Joey in murdering Mr. Bocanegra and Mrs.  
5 Bocanegra (RT 2843-45, 2851-54, 2856-59) and that he desired to enter a guilty plea. (SPet. Ex.  
6 520, p. 2; see CT 891-92; RT [5/16/88] 7; RT-108a-155a.) Evidence suggesting the presence of  
7 a third non-victim in the Bocanegra Home does not does demonstrate or suggest a third person  
8 was present during the murders. (See claim 30, 32, *ante*.)

9 The Court finds the state court rejection of the claim was not contrary to, or an  
10 unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law, as determined by the Supreme  
11 Court. Nor was the state court's ruling was based on an unreasonable determination of the facts  
12 in light of the evidence presented in the state court proceeding, viewed most favoring the  
13 prosecution, Jackson, 443 U.S. at 319. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

14 Claim 38 is denied.

15 **d. Review of Claim 39**

16 Petitioner next alleges prosecutorial misconduct through use of false evidence at the  
17 penalty phase by Pathologist Holloway. He alleges that Holloway falsely testified at the penalty  
18 phase that Mr. Bocanegra's head wounds were a "contributory cause" of death, contradicting his  
19 guilt phase testimony and prosecutor Ryals argument based thereon that head wounds neither  
20 caused nor contributed to Mr. Bocanegra's death. Petitioner claims Ryals knew or should have  
21 known this testimony was false.

22 The California Supreme Court summarily denied claim 39 (SPet. Claim EE) raised in  
23 Petitioner's state petition for habeas corpus. In re Sanchez, S049502 (DD).

24 The State Supreme Court also considered this claim on appeal and found that:

25 [T]he prosecutor did not commit misconduct in failing to correct Dr. Holloway's  
26 characterization of the nonfatal scalp wounds to Juan Bocanegra as a  
27 "contributory cause" rather than an "other condition" of death. The  
28 characterization of the scalp wounds as contributing to Juan's death was  
minimally significant to the jury's assessment of defendant's culpability in the  
murders. The facts showed that defendant struck disabling blows to the victim's

1 head while Joey was stabbing him. Moreover, any misperceptions of the cause of  
2 Juan's death were corrected by the prosecutor's opening statement that the wounds  
3 inflicted by defendant with a metal bar, "were not the actual blows that killed the  
4 man. They were only a part of what killed the man. The actual blow to the man  
5 was the stab wound inflicted by his son while defendant was beating him in the  
6 head with an iron pipe."

5 Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 71.

6 Under Napue the knowing use of false or perjured testimony against a defendant to obtain  
7 a conviction is unconstitutional. A conviction obtained by the knowing use of perjured  
8 testimony "must be set aside if there is any reasonable likelihood that the false testimony could  
9 have affected the judgment of the jury." Bagley, 473 U.S. at 678. Nevertheless, simple  
10 inconsistencies in testimony are insufficient to establish that a prosecutor knowingly permitted  
11 the admission of false testimony. Zuno-Arce, 44 F.3d at 1423. "Discrepancies in . . . testimony  
12 . . . could as easily flow from errors in recollection as from lies." Id. To warrant habeas relief,  
13 Petitioner must establish that: 1) the testimony was actually false; 2) the prosecution knew or  
14 should have known it to be false; and 3) there is a reasonable likelihood that the false testimony  
15 could have affected the jury's verdict. Scott, 251 F.3d at 1130.

16 Here, Dr. Holloway's testimony was consistent from preliminary hearing through penalty  
17 phase that Mr. Bocanegra died from three fatal stab wounds to the torso. (RT 2697, 2699-2700.)  
18 Prosecutor Ryals argued as much in her opening statement. (RT 2620.) Holloway's preliminary  
19 hearing characterization of scalp wounds as an "other condition" attendant to fatal stab wounds,  
20 (CT 112-119, 158-59), and Holloway's penalty phase characterization of the same scalp wounds  
21 as a "contributory cause" attendant to fatal stab wounds, (RT 2706), was not erroneous because  
22 Holloway used the terms interchangeably to characterize non-fatal wounds. (SPet. Ex. 120, pp.  
23 1-4.) The same applies to Mrs. Bocanegra, who also suffered scalp wounds but died from stab  
24 wounds. (CT 115-117, 153-154.)

25 For the reasons stated and those discussed in Claims 31 and 32, it is not reasonably  
26 likely Holloway's characterization of Mr. Bocanegra's head wounds as either "other conditions"  
27 or a "contributory cause" misled the jury in its assessment of Petitioner's culpability. The state  
28

1 court was not unreasonable in concluding that:

2  
3       “The characterization of the scalp wounds as contributing to Juan’s death was  
4 minimally significant to the jury’s assessment of defendant’s culpability in the  
5 murders. The facts showed that defendant struck disabling blows to the victim’s  
6 head while Joey was stabbing him. Moreover, any misperceptions of the cause of  
7 Juan’s death were corrected by the prosecutor’s opening statement that the  
8 wounds inflicted by defendant with a metal bar, were not the actual blows that  
9 killed the man. They were only a part of what killed the man. The actual blow to  
10 the man was the stab wound inflicted by his son while defendant was beating him  
11 in the head with an iron pipe.”

12       Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 71.

13       A fair-minded jurist could conclude from the evidence and statements Petitioner made to  
14 Hernandez and Trihey, that Petitioner assisted Joey in murdering Mr. Bocanegra and Mrs.  
15 Bocanegra (RT 2843-45, 2851-54, 2856-59) and that he desired to enter a guilty plea. (SPet. Ex.  
16 520, p. 2; see CT 891-92; RT [5/16/88] 7; RT-108a-155a.)

17       Respondent contends claim 39 is not cognizable because it creates and retroactively  
18 applies a “new rule” of constitutional law within Teague v. Lane, 489 U.S. 288. However, the  
19 Court finds the claim fails not because Petitioner seeks to apply a new rule of criminal procedure  
20 under Teague, but rather on grounds the claim lacks merit for the reasons stated.

21       This Court does not find that the state court rejection of the claim was contrary to, or an  
22 unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law, as determined by the Supreme  
23 Court, or that the state court’s ruling was based on an unreasonable determination of the facts in  
24 light of the evidence presented in the state court proceeding, viewed most favoring the  
25 prosecution, Jackson, 443 U.S. at 319. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

26       Claim 39 is denied.

27       **e.      Review of Claim 40**

28       In his next claim, Petitioner alleges prosecutorial misconduct by failure to disclose  
29 exculpatory evidence and using false evidence by Hernandez at the penalty phase.

30       The California Supreme Court summarily denied claim 40 (SPet. Claims FF) raised in  
31 Petitioner’s state petition for habeas corpus. In re Sanchez, S049502 (DD). In such a case, “the

1 habeas petitioner's burden still must be met by showing there was no reasonable basis for the  
2 state court to deny relief," Richter, 562 U.S. at 98, and this Court "must determine what  
3 arguments or theories supported or . . . *could have supported*, the state court's decision; and then  
4 it must ask whether it is possible fair-minded jurists could disagree that those arguments or  
5 theories are inconsistent with the holding in a prior decision of this Court." Id. (emphasis  
6 added).

7 As noted, there are three components of a Brady violation: (1) the evidence at issue must  
8 be favorable to the accused either because it is exculpatory or because it is impeaching; (2) the  
9 evidence must have been suppressed by the State either willfully or inadvertently; and (3)  
10 prejudice must have ensued. Banks, 540 U.S. at 691; Strickler, 527 U.S. at 281–82. "Such  
11 evidence is material if there is a reasonable probability that, had the evidence been disclosed to  
12 the defense, the result of the proceeding would have been different." Strickler, 527 U.S. at 280,  
13 (quoting Bagley, 473 U.S. 667, 682 (1985)). "[T]here is never a real Brady violation unless the  
14 nondisclosure was so serious that there is a reasonable probability that the suppressed evidence  
15 would have produced a different verdict." Strickler, 527 U.S. at 281.

16 Additionally, under Napue the knowing use of false or perjured testimony against a  
17 defendant to obtain a conviction is unconstitutional. A conviction obtained by the knowing use  
18 of perjured testimony "must be set aside if there is any reasonable likelihood that the false  
19 testimony could have affected the judgment of the jury." Bagley, 473 U.S. at 678. Nevertheless,  
20 simple inconsistencies in testimony are insufficient to establish that a prosecutor knowingly  
21 permitted the admission of false testimony. Zuno-Arce, 44 F.3d at 1423. "Discrepancies in . . .  
22 testimony . . . could as easily flow from errors in recollection as from lies." Id. To warrant  
23 habeas relief, Petitioner must establish that: 1) the testimony was actually false; 2) the  
24 prosecution knew or should have known it to be false; and 3) there is a reasonable likelihood that  
25 the false testimony could have affected the jury's verdict. Tayborn, 251 F.3d at 1130).

26 Petitioner cites to claims 2, 7 and 28 in support of this claim. He alleges Hernandez  
27 testified falsely regarding his deal with the prosecution - that the prosecution had only promised  
28

1 to tell the sentencing judge of Hernandez's testimony, when the circumstantial evidence, (SHCP  
2 Exhs. 510, 511), suggested that he had a promise of probation in exchange for his testimony; and  
3 that Hernandez concealed that he was in custody on a heroin charge; and falsely stated he  
4 contacted the police when detective Stratton initiated the contact.

5 Petitioner's claim is unpersuasive. He has not made an evidentiary showing that there  
6 was an undisclosed sentence concession or that Hernandez testified falsely. (See claims 1-4 and  
7 28, *ante*.) The record that was before the state court does not reasonably support any undisclosed  
8 sentence concession(s). (See SResp. Ex. B.) Hernandez's testimony that he contacted police,  
9 through a request made to a jail deputy (CT 477; see RT 2840) is not materially false and could  
10 not reasonably have affected the jury's imposition of the death sentence given the noted  
11 substantial evidence against Petitioner. Petitioner claims, but makes no evidentiary showing that  
12 Hernandez was a heroin addict.

13 For the reasons stated, a fair-minded jurist could have found that the state court rejection  
14 of claims by the modified opinion was neither contrary to, or an unreasonable application of,  
15 clearly established federal law, as determined by the Supreme Court, nor an unreasonable  
16 determination of the facts in light of the evidence presented in the state court proceeding. See 28  
17 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

18 Claim 40 is denied

19 **f. Review of Claim 41**

20 Petitioner next claims prosecutorial misconduct in Losing/Destroying Exculpatory  
21 Evidence at Penalty phase. He claims the police or prosecution lost or destroyed Hernandez's  
22 contemporaneous notes of conversations with Petitioner; notes which could have been used to  
23 impeach Hernandez.

24 The California Supreme Court summarily denied claim 41 (SPet. Claims GG) raised in  
25 Petitioner's state petition for habeas corpus. In re Sanchez, S049502 (DD). “[T]he habeas  
26 petitioner's burden still must be met by showing there was no reasonable basis for the state court  
27 to deny relief,” Richter, 562 U.S. at 98, and this Court “must determine what arguments or  
28

1 theories supported or . . . *could have supported*, the state court’s decision; and then it must ask  
2 whether it is possible fair-minded jurists could disagree that those arguments or theories are  
3 inconsistent with the holding in a prior decision of this Court.” Id. (emphasis added).

4 Where the government fails to preserve evidence that is only potentially exculpatory, the  
5 right to due process is violated only if [the evidence] possesses “an exculpatory value that was  
6 apparent before the evidence was destroyed, and [is] of such a nature that the defendant would be  
7 unable to obtain comparable evidence by other reasonably available means.” Trombetta, 467  
8 U.S. at 489.

9 For the same reasons state in claim 29, *ante*, Plaintiff has not made a sufficient  
10 evidentiary showing that Hernandez acted for the police, or that the police and prosecution were  
11 required to preserve alleged notes of conversations Hernandez had with Petitioner, or that the  
12 notes had material exculpatory value.

13        Respondent contends claim 41 is not cognizable because it creates and retroactively  
14 applies a “new rule” of constitutional law within Teague v. Lane, 489 U.S. 288. However, the  
15 Court finds the claim fails not because Petitioner seeks to apply a new rule of criminal procedure  
16 under Teague, but rather on grounds the claim lacks merit for the reasons stated.

17 A fair-minded jurist could have found that Petitioner failed to establish that the state court  
18 rejection of the claim was contrary to, or an unreasonable application of, clearly established  
19 federal law, as determined by the Supreme Court. Nor was the state court's ruling based on an  
20 unreasonable determination of the facts in light of the evidence presented in the state court  
21 proceeding, viewed most favoring the prosecution. Jackson, 443 U.S. at 319. See 28 U.S.C. §  
22 2254(d).

23 | Claim 41 is denied.

**g. Review of Claim 42**

25 Petitioner next claims prosecutorial misconduct during penalty phase closing argument.

26 The California Supreme Court summarily denied claim 42 (SPet. Claims JJ) raised in  
27 Petitioner's state petition for habeas corpus. *In re Sanchez*, S049502 (DD).

1       The California Supreme Court also considered this claim on appeal and found that the  
2 defense had not objected on this ground or sought a curative admonition at trial and thus waived  
3 the issue on appeal, Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 65-66. Additionally, the state supreme court found as  
4 follows:

5           [A]ny error that did occur was harmless. As we explain in detail below, although  
6 the prosecutor may have, at times, pushed the limits of proper advocacy, any  
7 misconduct that did occur could not have contributed to the verdict and was thus  
rendered harmless.

8       Defendant contends Ryals improperly told the jury that he was Tatman's actual  
9 killer, and that Tatman was killed with a screwdriver seized from him. Defendant  
10 also asserts that Ryals improperly treated defendant's conviction under section  
11 187 (without special circumstances) as a capital crime. Her argument, claims  
defendant, violated the doctrines of collateral estoppel and double jeopardy, and  
denied him his constitutional rights under both the state and federal Constitutions.

12       Defendant's first claim, that the prosecutor improperly argued to the jury that he  
13 was Tatman's actual killer, was based on the following comments made during the  
prosecutor's closing argument:

14           "First, Mr. Tatman, an old, sick man, wheelchair bound, living from payday to  
15 payday in the Bakersfield Inn, hardly a match for the defendant alone much less  
for the defendant and his friend, Robert Reyes.

16           "Think of the old man lying in his bed, fearful because there were burglars in his  
17 little room at the Bakersfield Inn. Think of how that fear turned to horror as he  
realized that they weren't just burglars but that they intended to take his life.  
Imagine how he must have felt when they approached him.

18           "Of course, the defendant told the police that he had no actual part in the murder,  
19 that he watched his buddy do it. But then, when you think of that, think that the  
defendant learned to lie to authorities at an early age, I believe Dr. Wright said the  
20 third grade. Remember that he denied to the police also anything or any facts  
concerning the Bocanegra murders, but then remember what he told Rufus  
Hernandez.

21           "He told Rufus Hernandez what happened, how the two of them killed Mr.  
22 Tatman, not how Robert [Reyes] killed Mr. Tatman or how he killed Mr. Tatman  
but how they killed Mr. Tatman. Think of that when you are considering what the  
23 penalty in this case should be.

24           "The two men could have taken the food. They could have taken the refrigerator.  
25 They could have taken everything that was in that room and not touched that old  
man who weighed less than one hundred pounds. They could have gone into that  
room, completely cleared it out, even stripped the bed clothes out from under him  
and never harmed him, never hurt him at all. But they didn't do that. The  
defendant didn't do that. They chose, for some useless, senseless reason, to  
26 commit an act of violence, the ultimate, ultimate act of violence, murder."

1 In her rebuttal, the prosecutor told the jury that it should not attempt to relitigate  
2 the guilt phase facts, but then asked the jury to deliberate over what she had told  
3 it: "You do not know what evidence was presented in the previous hearing. You  
4 are not to re-litigate that at this time. You hear[d] the circumstances of the Batman  
murder. You know what the defendant told the police because you heard that. But  
you also know what the defendant told Rufus Hernandez because you heard that.  
It is up to you to weigh this and to deliberate on that and to determine who exactly  
struck the fatal blow."

5 Defendant asserts that the effect of the above argument was to ask "the jury to  
6 disregard completely the trial court's not true verdict on the robbery murder  
7 special circumstance under Count I which implicitly and necessarily rejected the  
8 charges that [defendant] was the actual killer in the Batman homicide and that he  
9 harbored an intent to kill in committing the crime." Defendant claims Ryals's  
10 argument sought to elevate a noncapital murder to which defendant was an  
11 accomplice into a capital murder in violation of the guarantee against double  
12 jeopardy following acquittal under the Fifth Amendment to the United States  
13 Constitution and article I, section 15 of the California Constitution, and the related  
14 doctrine of collateral estoppel. [Citation]

15 In making his argument, defendant points to the court's guilt phase verdict, in  
16 which the court found defendant acted as an accomplice (and not the actual killer)  
17 in the Batman murder:

18 "As to the first count [the Batman murder], the Court finds defendant guilty of  
19 murder and fixes that murder as murder in the first degree based on the felony  
20 murder rule.

21 "The Court finds that it is not true that the murder of Woodrow Wilson Batman  
22 was committed while the defendant was engaged in the commission or attempted  
23 commission of a felony, to wit: The crime of robbery, within the meaning of the  
24 special circumstance section. That does not mean, I hasten to add, that I do not  
25 think there was a robbery in progress; that simply means that I find that the  
26 defendant was an aider and abettor of the robbery but that the homicide occurred  
27 in the commission of that, and therefore it's a first degree felony murder."

28 The People observe that this verdict appears inconsistent. The confusion over the  
29 verdict is highlighted by the fact that early in the guilt phase arguments, the  
30 prosecutor appeared to concede (and the court appeared to agree) that defendant  
31 could be found guilty only of second degree felony murder in connection with the  
32 Batman killing. Of course, any inconsistency in the verdict was harmless in light  
33 of our law recognizing that accomplice status is sufficient to elevate a defendant's  
34 complicity in the crime to the robbery-murder special circumstance as long as  
35 defendant acted with "intent to kill." [Citation]

36 What is clear from the verdict is the court's finding that defendant aided and  
37 abetted the robbery, and that the murder verdict was based on the felony-murder  
38 rule. It is less clear, however, whether the court found defendant was or was not  
39 the actual killer. If we assume the court found the special circumstance untrue  
40 because the prosecution had proved neither that defendant was the actual killer,  
41 nor that he had the intent to kill, prosecutorial argument attempting to re-litigate  
42 the guilt phase as to actual killer status was improper. [Citation] To the extent  
43 Ryals crossed the line of proper argument, however, any misconduct was not  
44 prejudicial to defendant because it is not reasonably possible a result more  
45 favorable to the defendant would have occurred. Defendant was convicted of the

1 multiple murders of Juan and Juanita Bocanegra (§ 190.2, subd. (a)(3)), and the  
2 jury was aware of defendant's prior violent criminal activity (§ 190.3, factors (b)  
& (c)). Thus, Ryals's references to defendant's role in the Batman murder could  
not have affected the outcome of the penalty phase. [Citation]

3 Defendant next claims that the prosecutor deliberately misled the jury by her  
4 opening statement comment that Batman was actually murdered by Reyes with a  
5 screwdriver that had been stolen from the Bocanegra residence and later found on  
6 defendant's person. [Citation] Defendant asserts the prosecutor's comment  
7 contradicted guilt phase evidence indicating that Batman was mortally wounded  
8 by a "massive blunt force injury to the left chest," consistent with a heel stomp or  
blow by a similar object (with a dimension of two to three inches). According to  
the autopsy report, the screwdriver wounds were superficial stab wounds that did  
not actually contribute to Batman's death. Accordingly, defendant contends, the  
prosecutor's misstatement of the evidence rendered the penalty phase  
fundamentally unfair. [Citation]

9 Any inaccurate reference to the screwdriver as the actual murder weapon (or  
10 comment that the weapon was found on defendant) could not properly be  
11 characterized as prejudicial or so egregious as to deny defendant a fair trial.  
12 [Citation] When, as here, the point focuses on the prosecutor's comments to the  
jury, the question is whether there is a reasonable possibility that the jury  
construed or applied any of the complained-of remarks in an objectionable  
manner. [Citation]

13 Here, the jury was told that only nonfatal stab wounds were inflicted upon  
14 Batman. Forensic pathologist Holloway testified that the cause of Batman's death  
15 was massive blunt force injury to his chest. Holloway also stated that some of the  
injuries sustained by Batman were multiple superficial stab wounds to the chest  
"none of which would be construed as capable of a cause of death in themselves,"  
and a superficial stab wound to the abdomen which "would not itself have been a  
fatal wound."

17 In addition, Bakersfield Police Detective Boggs testified that, on March 23, 1987,  
18 defendant told him that after he and Reyes had entered Batman's hotel room, he  
saw Reyes standing over Batman in a threatening manner with a screwdriver in  
19 his hand, that Reyes "freaked out" and stabbed Batman with a screwdriver  
although defendant never saw the screwdriver enter Batman's body, and that  
Reyes "possessed the screwdriver at all times."

21 Moreover, the jury was consistently admonished by the court that it was to  
22 consider only the evidence presented, and that the opening statements of the  
lawyers were not to be considered evidence. The court admonished the jury that:  
23 "The important thing to remember is that what lawyers say in a trial, what they  
say in their argument, what they say in their opening statements, those simply are  
not evidence. They are just telling you what they expect to prove. You have to  
decide this case, however, based on what you hear under oath from the witness  
stand or based on some documents or pictures that I admit for your consideration.  
What a lawyer says . . . is not evidence." [Citation] The court repeated its  
25 admonition following closing arguments.

26 Taken in context as an attempt to counter defense counsel's argument that  
27 defendant did not participate in the Batman killing, it is not reasonably possible  
the prosecutor's alleged inaccurate remarks about the Batman murder misled the  
jury. [Citation] Moreover, the court's instruction that the lawyers' opening and  
28

1 closing statements were not to be considered evidence by the jury vitiating the  
2 misleading effect of any inaccurate remarks. The court's instructions are  
3 determinative in their statement of law, and we presume the jury treated the  
4 court's instructions as statements of law, and the prosecutor's comments as words  
5 spoken by an advocate in an attempt to persuade. [Citation] We cannot conclude  
6 on this record that the prosecutor's isolated mischaracterization of the evidence in  
7 her opening statement misled the jury.

8 Defendant also asserts that by discussing the circumstances of the Tatman killing  
9 during the penalty phase, the prosecutor improperly misled the jury into believing  
10 it could sentence defendant to death for the murder of Tatman alone, when the  
11 penalty should have been considered only for the Bocanegra crimes, in which the  
12 multiple-murder special circumstance was found true.

13 Defendant's argument is misplaced. The circumstances of the Tatman crime were  
14 properly argued as an aggravating factor under section 190.3, factor (a)  
15 (circumstances of the crime and the existence of any special circumstances found  
16 to be true pursuant to section 190.1). [Citation] Moreover, defense counsel  
17 reminded the jury of defendant's aider and abettor status in the Tatman murder  
18 when he stated: "Ted Sanchez did not kill Mr. Tatman nor did he share in Robert  
19 Reyes's intent to kill Mr. Tatman. Ted's role in that tragic incident was limited to  
20 removing some of Mr. Tatman's property." Hence, we find no prosecutorial error  
21 occurred in Ryals's discussion of the circumstances of the Tatman murder at the  
22 penalty phase.

23 Defendant's other claims of prosecutorial misconduct to which there was no  
24 defense objection are not supported by the record. For example, defendant's  
25 contention that the prosecutor allowed Detective Boggs to testify falsely as to who  
told him-Reyes or defendant-that both men had "kicked back" and "relaxed" after  
the Tatman murder, is simply a disagreement as to the interpretation of the  
evidence, and in no way indicates that Ryals encouraged or elicited false  
testimony from Boggs. In addition, the prosecutor did not commit misconduct in  
failing to correct Dr. Holloway's characterization of the nonfatal scalp wounds to  
Juan Bocanegra as a "contributory cause" rather than an "other condition" of  
death. The characterization of the scalp wounds as contributing to Juan's death  
was minimally significant to the jury's assessment of defendant's culpability in the  
murders. The facts showed that defendant struck disabling blows to the victim's  
head while Joey was stabbing him. Moreover, any misperceptions of the cause of  
Juan's death were corrected by the prosecutor's opening statement that the wounds  
inflicted by defendant with a metal bar, "were not the actual blows that killed the  
man. They were only a part of what killed the man. The actual blow to the man  
was the stab wound inflicted by his son while defendant was beating him in the  
head with an iron pipe."

26 Finally, defendant's claim that the prosecutor committed misconduct by asserting  
27 that the Bocanegras would not have been killed without defendant's assistance is  
28 without merit. The evidence supported the view that defendant restrained both  
victims while Joey Bocanegra stabbed them. "The argument came well within the  
broad discretion of the parties to state their views as to what the evidence shows  
and what inferences may be drawn therefrom." [Citation]

Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 66-72.

1 Petitioner alleges that prosecutor Ryals improperly argued and misstated evidence, that  
2 the Bocanegra and Tatman murders would not have occurred but for Petitioner's participation,  
3 that the jury was sentencing Petitioner for the Tatman murder, and that Petitioner stabbed Mr.  
4 Tatman to death, (See SHCP Ex. 124, ¶ 16), with a screwdriver (RT 2619.) Petitioner contends  
5 that the correct facts are that Petitioner was only vicariously liable in the murders, that Mr.  
6 Tatman was killed by blunt force rather than stab wounds (CT 109; RT 2695), and Petitioner was  
7 sentenced by the trial court to 25 years to life for the Tatman conviction.

8 The Court finds that the state court could reasonably have concluded this claim lacks  
9 merit. Petitioner contends the prosecution misled the jury into thinking it was sentencing  
10 Petitioner for the Tatman murder (RT 3047-3048), i.e., as a triple murderer (RT 3080), when in  
11 fact the trial court was responsible for sentencing Petitioner for the Tatman murder, which was a  
12 non-capital murder. (CT 1103; RT October 31, 1988 at p. 13.) Even if the prosecution argued  
13 that Petitioner played a principal role in the Tatman murder, the state court could reasonably  
14 have determined no prejudice resulted. The Tatman conviction was presented to the jury as  
15 evidence in aggravation. The jury was appropriately admonished and instructed in this regard.  
16 (RT 2615-2616; CT 979-1021; RT 3082-3097.) The record included testimony of pathologist,  
17 Dr. Holloway that Mr. Tatman died of blunt force injury to his chest. (RT 2695.) Nothing in the  
18 evidentiary record suggests the trial court's admonishment and jury instructions were not  
19 understood and followed. Moreover, the penalty phase evidence in aggravation was substantial  
20 as discussed in claims 1 through 4, *ante*.

21 The record suggests that, as to Mr. Tatman, it was Petitioner's decision to "hit the old  
22 man" and take his food and refrigerator, that Petitioner and Reyes entered Mr. Tatman's room,  
23 that Reyes made stabbing motions at Mr. Tatman with a screwdriver, and that Petitioner stole  
24 Mr. Tatman's possessions after witnessing his murder. (RT 2658-2666; SPet. Ex. 129, pp. 1-2.)  
25 Hernandez testified he told detective Stratton (RT 2848-2849; 2855-2856), that Petitioner told  
26 him that "[Petitioner] and two other men entered an old man's room at the Bakersfield Inn, that  
27 the old man was in a wheelchair, that they beat the old man, that he and the other men stabbed  
28

1 the old man with a screwdriver, and that they took the old man's money." (RT 2842, 2846-2848.)  
2 Detective Stratton testified to that effect. (RT 2858-2861.)

3 The jury was made well aware that Mr. Tatman's stabbing wounds were non-fatal  
4 injuries and that Petitioner's conviction for Mr. Tatman's murder was based on his aiding and  
5 abetting Reyes. (Id.; RT 235, 2693-2695.) Defense counsel made its argument to the jury that  
6 Petitioner did not intend to kill Mr. Tatman.

7 Ryals' argument that Petitioner had a principal role in the Bocanegra homicides, and that  
8 the Bocanegras would not have been killed without his assistance, did not in all reasonable  
9 likelihood mislead the jury or affect the death sentence imposed. The evidence weighed heavily  
10 against Petitioner as an aider and abettor of the homicides. Petitioner grabbed and held Mr.  
11 Bocanegra while Joey got a knife. (RT 2843, 2853-54.) Petitioner beat Mr. Bocanegra while  
12 Joey stabbed him. (RT 2696-2706, 2719-21, 2725, 2843-44, 2854, 2858.) Petitioner rushed  
13 Mrs. Bocanegra and told Joey to "shut her up." (RT 2844, 2858.) Petitioner pushed Mrs.  
14 Bocanegra into a back room and hit her on the head with a bar while Joey stabbed her. (RT  
15 2710-14, 2720-21, 2725, 2752, 2844.) This occurred Mrs. Bocanegra's hands were bound and  
16 she was likely gagged. (RT 2708, 2723, 2749-51, 2754-55, 2774-2775.)

17 Petitioner's proffer of statements by jurors Bobbie Crowder (SHCP Ex. 124, ¶ 16) and  
18 John Rodriguez (SHCP Ex. 109, App. A, ¶ 3) suggesting they believed Petitioner to be equally  
19 culpable with Joey in the Bocanegra murders, even if such statements were competent evidence,  
20 does not reasonably demonstrate prosecutorial misconduct sufficiently significant to deny a fair  
21 trial or lack confidence in the verdict, given the above noted evidence in aggravation.

22 Given the unrebutted evidence presented at the penalty phase, the admonitions of the trial  
23 judge that argument is not evidence, the potential aggravating and mitigating effects of  
24 circumstances surrounding the Bocanegra murders, the state court could reasonably have found  
25 that the prosecution arguments above were not so prejudicial as to make trial fundamentally  
26 unfair. The multiple murder special circumstance in the Bocanegra murders and the substantial  
27 evidence in aggravation presented during the penalty phase show that the state court could  
28

1 reasonably determine the outcome would not likely have been different absent the alleged  
2 prosecutorial misconduct. See Donnelly, 416 U.S. at 643 (improper jury argument by the state  
3 does not present a claim of constitutional magnitude unless it is so prejudicial that the  
4 petitioner's trial was fundamentally unfair . . . [t]o establish prejudice, the petitioner must  
5 demonstrate either persistent and pronounced misconduct or that the evidence was so  
6 insubstantial that, in all probability, but for the remarks, no conviction would have occurred); see  
7 also Darden, 477 U.S. at 182 (claim of prosecutorial misconduct rejected where the prosecutor's  
8 comments "did not manipulate or misstate the evidence, nor . . . implicate other specific rights of  
9 the accused, such as the right to counsel or to remain silent."); Furman v. Wood, 190 F.3d 1002,  
10 1006 (9th Cir. 1999) (rejecting habeas claim where, although some of prosecutor's arguments  
11 were improper, jury was told comments were not evidence, and evidence against defendant was  
12 substantial).

13 Generally, counsel are "given latitude in the presentation of their closing arguments, and  
14 courts must allow the prosecution to strike hard blows based on the evidence presented and all  
15 reasonable inferences therefrom." Ceja v. Stewart, 97 F.3d 1246, 1253–1254 (9th Cir. 1996)  
16 (quoting United States v. Baker, 10 F.3d 1374, 1415 (9th Cir. 1993)); see also United States v.  
17 Molina, 934 F.2d 1440, 1445 (9th Cir. 1991) (prosecutor has wide latitude during closing  
18 argument to make reasonable inferences based on the evidence).

19 Accordingly, the state court rejection of the claim was not contrary to, or an unreasonable  
20 application of, clearly established federal law, and the state court's ruling was not based on an  
21 unreasonable determination of the facts in light of the evidence presented in the state court  
22 proceeding, viewed most favoring the prosecution, Jackson, 443 U.S. 307, 319 (1979). See 28  
23 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

24 Claim 42 is denied on the merits.

25 11. Ineffective Assistance Of Counsel In Penalty Phase - Claims 43 through 61  
26 a. **Clearly Established Law**

27 The applicable legal standard is set forth above, in the preface to the Court's analysis of  
28

1 claims 6-18. The basic requirements of Strickland apply with equal force in the penalty phase.  
2 Thus, Petitioner must show that counsel's actions fell below an objective standard of  
3 reasonableness, and that the alleged errors resulted in prejudice. Strickland, 466 U.S. at 687-88.

4 In the context of the penalty phase, just as in the guilt phase, the Supreme Court has  
5 "declined to articulate specific guidelines for appropriate attorney conduct and instead [has]  
6 emphasized that '[t]he proper measure of attorney performance remains simply reasonableness  
7 under prevailing professional norms.'" Wiggins, 539 U.S. at 521 (quoting Strickland, 466 U.S.  
8 at 688). In the penalty phase, defense counsel has an "obligation to conduct a thorough  
9 investigation of the defendant's background," Williams, 529 U.S. at 396, and defense counsel has  
10 a duty to investigate, develop, and present mitigation evidence during penalty phase proceedings,  
11 Wiggins, 539 U.S. at 521-23. Counsel has a duty to make a "diligent investigation into his  
12 client's troubling background and unique personal circumstances." Williams, 529 U.S. at 415  
13 (O'Connor, J., concurring).

14 However, the Supreme Court has recognized that the duty to investigate does not require  
15 defense counsel "to scour the globe on the off chance something will turn up; reasonably diligent  
16 counsel may draw a line when they have good reason to think further investigation would be a  
17 waste." Rompilla v. Beard, 545 U.S. 374, 382-83 (2005) (citing Wiggins, 539 U.S. at 525  
18 (further investigation excusable where counsel has evidence suggesting it would be fruitless));  
19 Strickland, 466 U.S. at 699 (counsel could "reasonably surmise . . . that character and  
20 psychological evidence would be of little help"); Burger, 483 U.S. at 794 (limited investigation  
21 reasonable because all witnesses brought to counsel's attention provided predominantly harmful  
22 information). The Strickland court stated:

23  
24 [S]trategic choices made after thorough investigation of law and facts relevant to  
25 plausible options are virtually unchallengeable; and strategic choices made after  
26 less than complete investigation are reasonable precisely to the extent that  
27 reasonable professional judgments support the limitations on investigation. In  
28 other words, counsel has a duty to make reasonable investigations or to make a  
reasonable decision that makes particular investigations unnecessary. In any  
ineffectiveness case, a particular decision not to investigate must be directly  
assessed for reasonableness in all the circumstances, applying a heavy measure of  
deference to counsel's judgments.

1

2 Strickland, 466 U.S. at 690-691.

3 “In assessing counsel's investigation, the Court must conduct an objective review of their  
4 performance, measured for reasonableness under prevailing professional norms,” Strickland, 466  
5 U.S. at 688, which includes a context-dependent consideration of the challenged conduct as seen  
6 “from counsel's perspective at the time,” id., at 689 (“[e]very effort [must] be made to eliminate  
7 the distorting effects of hindsight”).” Wiggins, 539 U.S. at 523. Further, the reasonableness of  
8 counsel's actions may be determined or substantially influenced by the defendant's own  
9 statements or actions. Counsel's actions are usually based, quite properly, on informed strategic  
10 choices made by the defendant and on information supplied by the defendant. In particular, what  
11 investigation decisions are reasonable depends critically on such information. Strickland, 466  
12 U.S. at 691.

13 In order to demonstrate prejudice, Petitioner must show “a reasonable probability that,  
14 but for counsel's unprofessional errors, the result of the proceeding would have been different.”  
15 Id. at 693-94. To assess that probability, the reviewing court must consider the totality of the  
16 available mitigation evidence and reweigh it against the evidence in aggravation. Porter v.  
17 McCollum, 558 U.S. 30, 41 (2009) (citing Williams, 529 U.S. at 397-398). The court must  
18 consider whether the likelihood of a different result if the evidence had gone in is “sufficient to  
19 undermine confidence in the outcome” actually reached at sentencing. Rompilla, 545 U.S. at  
20 393 (quoting Strickland, 466 U.S. at 694).

21

**b. Review of Claim 43**

22 In this claim, Petitioner alleges ineffective assistance of counsel by failure to seek  
23 sufficient continuance to prepare for penalty phase and avoid adverse publicity from defense  
24 counsel Toton's impending disbarment.

25

The California Supreme Court summarily denied claim 43 (SPet. Claim LL) raised in  
Petitioner's state petition for habeas corpus. In re Sanchez, S049502 (DD). In this case, “the  
habeas petitioner's burden still must be met by showing there was no reasonable basis for the

26

1 state court to deny relief," *Richter*, 562 U.S. at 98, and this Court "must determine what  
2 arguments or theories supported or . . . *could have supported*, the state court's decision; and then  
3 it must ask whether it is possible fair-minded jurists could disagree that those arguments or  
4 theories are inconsistent with the holding in a prior decision of this Court." *Id.* (emphasis  
5 added).

6 Petitioner states that defense counsel Frank was aware that proper penalty phase  
7 preparation had not been completed when the penalty trial started. Petitioner faults Frank for  
8 failing to fully investigate neurological, psychiatric, drug use and social history defenses.  
9 Petitioner points to retained social historian Dr. Wright, who found the penalty preparations  
10 disorganized. (SHCP Ex. 131, Att. B, ¶ 6.) This disorganization, according to Dr. Wright, was  
11 exacerbated by the accelerated penalty phase time line following trial waiver at the guilt and  
12 special circumstances phase, (SHCP Ex. 137, ¶ 16), and by defense counsel's delay in paying  
13 defense service providers. (SHCP Ex. 137, Att. B, ¶ 16.) Dr. Wright also suggested aspects of  
14 the penalty defense were not completed by the time of the penalty trial (SHCP Ex. 137, App. B,  
15 ¶¶ 11-14), such that defense counsel should have requested a continuance. (SHCP Ex. 137, ¶¶  
16 10-21.)

17 However, the state court could reasonably find here, as it did in claim 13, *ante*, that  
18 additional preparation time was unnecessary. Defense counsel consulted with a serologist and  
19 retained defense psychologist Donaldson in 1987. (RT [5/16/88] 3-4.) Defense counsel Frank,  
20 who was responsible for the penalty phase, had almost completed his preparation when, on July  
21 14, 1988, Petitioner waived jury trial on guilt and special circumstances. (CT 892; RT-115a;  
22 SPet. Ex. 113, pp. 5-6.) By Frank's own estimate, his preparations were to be complete by July  
23 25, 1988. (RT [5/16/88] 6.) This was reasonably sufficient time given that the penalty phase did  
24 not begin until September 21, 1988. (CT 949.) Defense counsel Frank was able to complete his  
25 defense investigation prior to the penalty phase. (RT [5/16/88] 3-6.) During this time, Frank  
26 retained Dr. Wright to prepare the social history (SHCP Ex. 137, Att. B, ¶ 3), and hired defense  
27 investigators Peninger and McGregor. (SHCP Ex. 124, ¶¶ 1-2.) Given the foregoing, the state  
28

1 court could reasonably have found Dr. Wright allegations relating to inadequate trial preparation,  
2 if considered evidence, to be unpersuasive.

3 Defense counsel, having already been granted a partially opposed three week continuance  
4 on the eve of trial, could reasonably have concluded that a further continuance was unlikely.  
5 (RT [5/16/88] 5-6; CT 713-714.) Moreover, a further continuance was contrary to Petitioner's  
6 stated desire to plead guilty to the Bocanegra murders. (SPet. Ex. 520, p. 2; SPet. Ex. 700.)  
7 Petitioner waived jury trial (RT [5/16/88] 7-8) and submitted guilt and special circumstances  
8 phase on the preliminary hearing transcript and the testimony of additional prosecution  
9 witnesses. See Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 23-30. Dr. Wright's suggestion a continuance would have  
10 been granted could have been viewed as speculative.

11 Petitioner also alleges his defense was affected by publicity of the pending disbarment  
12 proceedings against defense counsel Toton. Petitioner asserts that defense Counsel Toton  
13 received substantial adverse publicity in the Bakersfield Californian from his impending  
14 debarment some two weeks before jury selection. However, the record does not demonstrate that  
15 jurors had knowledge of the debarment proceedings or that the jury was unfair or biased as to  
16 Toton's disciplinary matter. As discussed in claims 49 and 55, *post*, the California Supreme  
17 Court reasonably have determined that there was "no showing the jury was unfair or biased."  
18 Sanchez, 12 Cal. 4th at 62, n.6. That court noted that, during voir dire, only two of the jurors  
19 selected, Razo and Rodriguez, had heard of the case. (RT 1814-1815; 2458-2460, 2471.)  
20 Neither of those two jurors mentioned having hearing of Toton. Both of those jurors indicated  
21 they could put what they had heard out of mind while deliberating. *Id.* Petitioner proffers no  
22 evidence these statements were untrue.

23 It is well-established that "juror impartiality . . . does not require ignorance." Skilling v.  
24 United States, 561 U.S. 358, 360 (2010) 81 (citing Irvin v. Dowd, 366 U.S. 717, 722 (1961))  
25 (jurors are not required to be "totally ignorant of the facts and issues involved, scarcely any of  
26 those best qualified to serve as jurors will not have formed some impression or opinion as to the  
27 merits of the case."); Reynolds v. U.S., 98 U.S. 145, 155-156 (1878) ("[E]very case of public  
28

1 interest is almost, as a matter of necessity, brought to the attention of all the intelligent people in  
2 the vicinity, and scarcely any one can be found among those best fitted for jurors who has not  
3 read or heard of it, and who has not some impression or some opinion in respect to its merits.”).

4 When pretrial publicity is at issue, “primary reliance on the judgment of the trial court  
5 makes [especially] good sense” because the judge “sits in the locale where the publicity is said to  
6 have had its effect” and may base her evaluation on her “own perception of the depth and extent  
7 of news stories that might influence a juror.” Mu'Min v. Virginia, 500 U.S. 415, 427 (1991).

8 Here, for the reasons stated, the California Supreme Court could reasonably have  
9 concluded that there was no reasonable likelihood that Petitioner did not receive a fair trial  
10 despite limited pretrial publicity. Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 61. “A fair assessment of attorney  
11 performance requires that every effort be made to eliminate the distorting effects of hindsight . . .  
12 and to evaluate the conduct from counsel's perspective at the time.” Strickland, 466 U.S. at 689.  
13 Bearing that in mind, and as discussed in the claims above, the penalty phase evidence against  
14 Petitioner was substantial. Nothing suggests a reasonable likelihood of a more favorable  
15 outcome had there been a further continuance.

16 Accordingly, the state court could have reasonably determined that there was no  
17 competent evidence of juror bias arising from Toton’s state bar difficulties and related publicity.  
18 Petitioner has not established that defense counsel’s failure to seek a further continuance to  
19 prepare for the penalty trial and to avoid adverse publicity fell below an objective standard of  
20 reasonableness and that, but for counsel’s unprofessional errors, the result of the proceeding  
21 would have been different. Strickland, 466 U.S., at 687-694.

22 A fair-minded jurist could have found that the state court rejection of the claim was  
23 neither contrary to, or an unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law, as  
24 determined by the Supreme Court, nor an unreasonable determination of the facts in light of the  
25 evidence presented in the state court proceeding. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

26 Claim 43 is denied.

27 **c. Review of Claim 44**

28

1 Petitioner next claims ineffective assistance of counsel by the individual and cumulative  
2 failure to conduct additional investigation and present mitigating evidence in the Bocanegra  
3 homicides.

4 The California Supreme Court summarily denied claim 44 (SPet. Claim MM) raised in  
5 Petitioner's state petition for habeas corpus. In re Sanchez, S049502 (DD). In this case, "the  
6 habeas petitioner's burden still must be met by showing there was no reasonable basis for the  
7 state court to deny relief," Richter, 562 U.S. at 98, and this Court "must determine what  
8 arguments or theories supported or . . . could have supported, the state court's decision; and then  
9 it must ask whether it is possible fair-minded jurists could disagree that those arguments or  
10 theories are inconsistent with the holding in a prior decision of this Court." Id. (emphasis  
11 added).

12 The Court finds that Petitioner has not made a sufficient showing that he was prejudiced  
13 by defense counsel's failure to further investigate and present mitigating evidence of the  
14 Bocanegra homicides, for the reasons discussed below.

15 *i. Jailhouse Informant Hernandez*

16 The Court finds that, for reasons discussed in claims 2 and 7, the decision of defense  
17 counsel not to further investigate and impeach jailhouse informant Hernandez regarding  
18 substance abuse and heroin addiction (SCHP Exhs. 112, ¶ 10; 137, ¶ 37; 113, ¶ 34), and his  
19 changing testimony to inculpate Petitioner as an equal participant in all three homicides (CT 488;  
20 RT 2842-44), could reasonably reflect counsel's lack of knowledge of sufficient supporting facts.  
21 (SHCP Exhs. 137, ¶ 37; 113, ¶ 34; 112, ¶ 4.)

22 Additionally, it appears unlikely such impeachment would have been effective. See  
23 claims 2, 7, *ante*; see also Burger, 483 U.S. at 795 (failure to pursue fruitless or harmful  
24 investigation not unreasonable). The evidentiary record did not demonstrate that Hernandez, by  
25 virtue of his alleged substance addition, his plea deal, or otherwise, was motivated to and did  
26 testify falsely or inaccurately. (SPet. Ex. 900, pp. 4, 11; SResp. Ex. B.) Defense counsel Toton  
27 cross-examined Hernandez at the preliminary hearing and asked Hernandez about any  
28

1 undisclosed plea deal during cross-examination in the guilt and special circumstances phase.  
2 (CT 576-577.) Hernandez's testimony was consistent with Petitioner's statements and the  
3 physical evidence. (CT 355, 378-380; 576-77.) Hernandez was not offered any disposition of  
4 pending criminal matters prior to agreeing to testify at the Petitioner's proceeding. (Id.; See  
5 SResp. Ex. B.) Toton later cross-examined Hernandez during the penalty phase. Hernandez  
6 admitted a deal on a then pending charge in exchange for his testimony. (RT 2850-2857.) As  
7 discussed in claim 7, *ante*, Hernandez's testimony was not false or misleading.

8 Accordingly, the state court could reasonably have found that defense counsel were not  
9 deficient in the decision not to conduct additional investigation of Hernandez to impeach him.

10 *ii. Jailhouse Informant Seeley*

11 The Court finds that for reasons discussed in claims 2 and 8, the decision of defense  
12 counsel not to further investigate alleged statements of jailhouse informant Charles Seeley  
13 regarding Reyes's involvement in the Bocanegra homicides, could have been a reasonable trial  
14 tactic given the evidentiary record. Toton had dealt with Seeley in a separate matter and based  
15 thereon doubted Seeley's credibility and whether the prosecution would call him. (SPet. Ex.  
16 137, p. 4.) Seeley's version of events seemed contrary to the physical evidence at the Bocanegra  
17 crime scene. (SPet. Ex. 419, pp. 5-6, 17; CT 355-382.) See e.g., Denham, 954 F.2d at 1505-06  
18 (9th Cir. 1992) (defense counsel not ineffective where decision not to call witness based on  
19 inconsistencies in witness's testimony).

20 Also, Seeley's testimony could reasonably have been viewed as more inculpating of  
21 Petitioner than was Hernandez's testimony. (SPet. Ex. 419, pp. 6-8, 18-19.) Seeley's testimony  
22 would have been subject to rebuttal by the substantial contrary evidence from Hernandez,  
23 Stratton, Trihey, as well as by the crime scene physical evidence.

24 Defendant counsel Frank, for his part, had a tactical reason for not interviewing Seeley to  
25 the extent any evidence provided by Seeley related only to the guilt and special circumstances  
26 phase that were handled by Toton. (See SPet. Ex. 113, p. 4.)

27 Accordingly, the state court could reasonably have found that defense counsel was not  
28

1 deficient in the decision not to conduct further investigation of Seeley and present him as a  
2 defense witness.

iii. Joey Bocanegra

4 The Court finds that, for reasons discussed in claims 2 and 9, the evidentiary record could  
5 reasonably support as trial tactics, the failure of defense counsel to further investigate and  
6 present evidence about Joey's role in the murders of his parents including Joey's history of  
7 violence, violent temper, PCP use around the time of the murders, and the sudden fight with Mr.  
8 Bocanegra that preceded the murder. There was substantial evidence that Petitioner aided and  
9 abetted the Bocanegra murders with premeditation and deliberation. (See claims 1-8.) So much  
10 so that defense counsel chose not to object to the prosecution's two assailant theory.

11 Petitioner has not made an evidentiary showing of prejudice regarding evidence about  
12 Joey. In the face of such substantial evidence of guilt, the state court could reasonably have  
13 determined that a showing of Joey's temper and prior assaultive conduct would not have raised a  
14 reasonable doubt that Petitioner aided and abetted the premeditated and deliberate murders of  
15 Mr. Bocanegra and Mrs. Bocanegra. Moreover, such a defense was contrary to Petitioner's  
16 stated desire to plead guilty to the Bocanegra murders (SPet. Ex. 520, p. 2) and "dying for his  
17 crimes but dying with a clear conscience." (SPet. Ex. 700.) Petitioner waived jury trial and  
18 submitted guilt and special circumstances phase on the preliminary hearing transcript and the  
19 testimony of additional prosecution witnesses. See Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 23-30.

20 The state court could reasonably have found that the record did not suggest that evidence  
21 about Joey would have changed the result, given Petitioner's incriminating statements to  
22 detective Stratton and reporter Trihey and the crime scene evidence corroborated by Hernandez's  
23 testimony, (see claims 1-4, *ante*), supporting Petitioner's intent to aid and abet the murders.

24 The state court could reasonably have found that defense counsel was not deficient in the  
25 decision not to conduct additional investigation of Joey Bocanegra regarding his role in the  
26 murders of his parents.

iv. *Physical Evidence*

1       The Court finds that, for the reasons discussed in claims 1, 3, 10, 38 and 39, the failure of  
2 defense counsel to further investigate crime scene evidence was not unreasonable.

3       Petitioner revisits his allegations relating to Laskowski's testimony in this proceeding  
4 that crime scene photographs showed two types of shoe prints in the Bocanegra kitchen, and  
5 Laskowski's subsequent re-examination of the photographs and identification of three types of  
6 shoe patterns in the kitchen and outside the Bocanegra home. (Pet. Ex. 121, p. 2; Ex. 417, pp. 1-  
7 2; SHCP 137, Ex. A.) Petitioner argues further investigation could have shown that Reyes, not  
8 Petitioner, caused the scalp wounds. However, Reyes admitted in subsequent proceedings that  
9 he served as lookout during the murders and entered the residence only afterwards to assist  
10 Petitioner and Joey. (SResp., Ex. A.) Evidence of Petitioner's shoepoint in the kitchen also  
11 undermines Seeley's testimony that Petitioner watched the assault on Mr. Bocanegra from the  
12 hallway. (SHCP, Ex. 419, pp. 6, 7, 22-23.) Evidence suggesting the presence of a third non-  
13 victim in the Bocanegra Home does not does demonstrate or suggest a third person was present  
14 during the murders. (See claim 30, 32, *ante*.) Significantly, defense counsel did not to object to  
15 the two assailant theory (SHCP Ex. 137, ¶ 22) and the state record suggests this decision was not  
16 unreasonable.

17       Petitioner also revisits testimony by Dr. Holloway that the scalp wounds were non-fatal.  
18 (CT 119, 158-159.) Petitioner argues that further investigation could have shown the blows to  
19 the head were not of such force as would show an intent to kill. However, as discussed in claims  
20 1 and 3, there was substantial evidence of Petitioner's aider and abetter liability. The violent  
21 nature and extended duration of the struggles with Mr. Bocanegra and Mrs. Bocanegra, with  
22 Joey taking time to get a kitchen knife, and Petitioner attempting to subdue and restrain each of  
23 the victims during Joey's assault on them, along with the multiple stab and blunt force wounds  
24 inflicted during room to room struggle with the victims, reasonably suggest a plan to kill them.  
25 (CT112-120; 149-156; 159; 167; 181; 192-194; 357-383; 479-483; 488.) Each victim suffered  
26 multiple stab wounds (id.) and was left unassisted to hemorrhage to death. (CT 114-119.) There  
27 was evidence Mrs. Bocanegra's wrists had been tied together and that she had been gagged. (CT  
28

1 113, 149-150, 153.) She suffered 26 stab wounds, three fatal, and six scalp wounds during the  
2 struggle. (CT 115-116, 153-154.) Mr. Bocanegra was stabbed at least eight times and had nine  
3 scalp wounds. (Id.) Defense counsel could reasonably have determined to focus limited  
4 resources elsewhere.

5 Additionally, there is no reasonable likelihood that the foregoing testimony of Laskowski  
6 and Holloway affected the jury's imposition of the death penalty, see Agurs, 427 U.S. at 103, or  
7 made trial so fundamentally unfair as to deny due process. Donnelly, 416 U.S. at 645. The  
8 evidence against Petitioner was substantial. A fair-minded jurist could conclude from the  
9 evidence and statements Petitioner made to Hernandez and Detective Stratton, that Petitioner  
10 assisted Joey in murdering Mr. Bocanegra and Mrs. Bocanegra (RT 2843-45, 2851-2854, 2856-  
11 59) and that he desired to enter a guilty plea. (SPet. Ex. 520, p. 2; see CT 891-92; RT [5/16/88]  
12 7; RT- 108a-155a.)

13 Defense counsel's failure to further investigate and rebut the prosecution's physical  
14 evidence supporting the two assailant theory was not unreasonable given the evidentiary record.

15 v. Mental Defenses

16 The Court finds that, for the reasons discussed in claims 2 and 6, the failure of defense  
17 counsel to further investigate and present mitigating evidence of Petitioner's organic brain  
18 damage and psychiatric impairments could reasonably be justified by a lack of supporting  
19 evidence. (SHCP Exhs. 113, ¶ 31; 139, ¶ 11; 136, ¶ 10.) The evidentiary record suggests that  
20 Petitioner was not under the influence of phencyclidine (PCP), marijuana, or alcohol at the time  
21 of the Bocanegra and Batman murders. The evidence proffered by Petitioner suggests a history  
22 of substance abuse (SPet. Exhs. 105, pp. 64-65, 74-75; 110, p. 1; 119, p. 8; 123, p.1; 128, pp. 1-  
23 2), continuing through the weeks prior to the murders. (SPet. Ex. 105, pp. 85-87.) However,  
24 Respondent correctly points to the absence of competent evidence that Petitioner ingested and/or  
25 was under the influence of phencyclidine, marijuana, or alcohol on the days the Bocanegra and  
26 Batman murders occurred.

27 As discussed in claim 6, defense psychologist Donaldson did not recommended to  
28

1 defense counsel that a neuropsychological evaluation be performed. Court appointed psychiatrist  
2 Matychowiak, following his November 1987 examination, found that Petitioner was not suicidal  
3 or delusional or suffering memory gaps (SPet. Ex. 520, p.5); that Petitioner planned to tell the  
4 judge he was guilty (Id. at 2); and that Petitioner understood the proceedings and could cooperate  
5 with counsel. (Id. at 6.) Petitioner told Matychowiak that he planned to tell the jury he was  
6 guilty and “get it over with.” (SPet. Ex. 520, p. 2.) Dr. Matychowiak found Petitioner  
7 competent to stand trial. (SPet. Ex. 520, p. 2-6.)

8 The state court could reasonably have found that defense counsel were not deficient in  
9 the decision not to conduct additional investigation of mental state defenses.

10 Accordingly, all the foregoing allegations of failure to investigate and present mitigating  
11 evidence are insubstantial when considered cumulatively for the reasons stated. See Karterman,  
12 60 F.3d at 580.

13 For the reasons stated, a fair-minded jurist could have found that the state court rejection  
14 of this claim was neither contrary to, or an unreasonable application of, clearly established  
15 federal law, as determined by the Supreme Court, nor an unreasonable determination of the facts  
16 in light of the evidence presented in the state court proceeding. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

17 Claim 44 is denied.

18 **d. Review of Claim 45**

19 In his next claim, Petitioner alleges ineffective assistance by counsel’s failure to object to  
20 admission of prejudicial crime scene and autopsy photographs.

21 The California Supreme Court summarily denied claim 44 (SPet. Claim NN) raised in  
22 Petitioner’s state petition for habeas corpus. In re Sanchez, S049502 (DD).

23 The state supreme court also considered and rejected this claim on appeal:

24  
25 The trial court admitted into evidence 44 photographs, including 2 photographs of  
26 the autopsies of Juan and Juanita Bocanegra depicting the extensive nature of  
27 their scalp wounds. (Exhibits Nos. 13 & 14.) The autopsy photographs had been  
28 excluded from the guilt phase following a successful motion in limine by  
defendant. The trial court overruled defendant’s objection to the admission of the  
autopsy photographs, however, for the penalty phase. We first review his  
contention that the trial court erred in admitting the autopsy photographs because

1 they were cumulative, misleading and inflammatory, and their prejudicial effect  
2 substantially outweighed their probative value.

3 In overruling defendant's objection, the court stated: "These scalp wounds are  
4 absolutely very important that the jury see. And they are not the kind of autopsy  
5 pictures-they're bad, I'll say that, all autopsy pictures are bad, but they're not the  
6 blood and guts type of thing that you sometimes see in autopsy pictures. And I  
7 think the prejudicial effect is far, far, far, and I can't stress it enough, outweighed  
8 by the probative value of these scalp wounds."

9 Defendant contends the trial court committed prejudicial error in admitting  
10 Exhibits Nos. 13 and 14 in violation of his right to a fair trial and reliable penalty  
11 determination under the Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments of the federal  
12 Constitution. The thrust of his argument is that the photos were not relevant to the  
13 penalty determination, were cumulative to the testimony of Dr. Holloway (the  
14 forensic pathologist who performed the autopsies on the Bocanegras), and  
15 seriously misled the jury as to defendant's culpability in the Bocanegra murders.  
16 In sum, the sole purpose of allowing the photographs, defendant asserts, was to  
17 improperly shock and horrify the jury.

18 Defendant points to the prosecutor's explanation to the jury as to why she believed  
19 the autopsy photographs were important evidence and asserts her comment  
20 actually exploited the prejudicial effect of the evidence: "You will have the  
21 pictures available to you. Look at the scalp wounds. You make the decision. But  
22 whatever, [Mrs. Bocanegra] would not have been killed but for the help of Teddy  
23 Brian Sanchez, and he is just as guilty of the murder as Joey Bocanegra."  
24 Defendant claims that because the probative value of the photographs was clearly  
25 outweighed by their prejudicial effect, their admission violated his constitutional  
26 rights.

27 The decision whether to admit photographs is within the trial court's discretion  
28 and will not be disturbed unless their prejudicial effect substantially outweighs  
1 their probative value. [Citation] We have examined Exhibits Nos. 13 and 14 and  
2 have determined they are not so horrific or shocking that we can conclude the trial  
3 court abused its discretion in admitting them. [Citation] The jury was familiar  
4 with the facts of the crime, and the photographs had substantial probative value in  
5 demonstrating defendant's culpability as an aider and abettor, and as corroborative  
6 of Hernandez's testimony implicating defendant in the crimes. Moreover, the  
7 probative value of the photographs was not diminished simply because the scalp  
8 wounds alone were not fatal to the victims. The photographs corroborated the  
9 testimonial evidence and were relevant to a determination of the appropriateness  
10 of the death penalty. [Citation]

11 Defendant's claim that there was no dispute as to the circumstances of the murders  
12 is not supported by the facts. Defense counsel Frank argued at the penalty phase  
13 that defendant should be spared the death penalty if the jury had a "lingering  
14 doubt" about the extent of defendant's participation in the Bocanegra killings.

15 Nor is defendant assisted by People v. Love (1960) 53 Cal.2d 843, 856-857, in  
16 which we held that the trial court's admission of a photograph showing the  
17 victim's face as she was dying, and of a tape recording of her last words as she lay  
18 on a hospital table in extreme pain, was prejudicial because it "served primarily to  
19 inflame the passions of the jurors." [Citation] Here, by contrast, the autopsy  
20 photographs depicting the Bocanegras' scalp wounds were clearly probative of (i)  
21 the manner in which the victims were wounded, (ii) defendant's culpability as an  
22

1 aider and abettor, (iii) the malice and aggravation of the crime, and (iv) the  
2 appropriate ultimate penalty. [Citation]

3 Because we find no error in admitting the autopsy photographs, we need not  
4 address defendant's claims that admission of other photographs during the penalty  
5 phase (Exhibits Nos. 9, 18, 19 & 25, depicting the wounds on the Bocanegras and  
6 Tatman) did not render harmless the prejudicial effect of the autopsy photos. Nor  
7 do we address defendant's related argument that, assuming we conclude the  
8 admission of these photographs "undercut the prejudice resulting from the  
9 admission" of the autopsy photographs, trial counsel was ineffective for failing to  
10 object to their admission. Neither argument is persuasive in light of our  
11 conclusion that the court did not err in admitting the autopsy photographs at the  
12 penalty phase.

13 Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 63-65.

14 A due process claim can be stated where graphic photos of victims make the trial  
15 fundamentally unfair. Jammal, 926 F.2d at 919. However, photos that are relevant to the crime  
16 charges and elements thereof are admissible. See Villafuerte v. Lewis, 75 F.3d 1330, 1343  
17 (1996). Under California law, "photographs which disclose the manner in which the victim was  
18 wounded are relevant on the issues of malice and aggravation of the crime and the penalty."  
19 People v. Thompson, 50 Cal.3d 134, 182 (1990).

20 Petitioner, citing in support to claim 56, *post*, alleges the jury was allowed to view  
21 inflammatory and prejudicial autopsy, crime scene and victim photographs (RT 2891-2892),  
22 depicting graphic and gory injuries unrelated to actions attributed to Petitioner, which should  
23 have been excluded under California Evidence Code section 352, and that caused the penalty  
24 trial to be fundamentally unfair. He claims there was no tactical reason not to object to these  
25 photographs.

26 The state record shows that defense counsel Toton did move to exclude all photographs  
27 during the guilt phase (RT-30a-33a). At the penalty phase, two autopsy photos of Mr. Bocanegra  
28 and Juanita's scalp wounds (People's Exhs. 13, 14) were admitted, over the defense's objection,  
(RT 2876, 2880-2281, 2285, 2891-2892), and the victim photos were admitted without objection.  
(RT 2891).

29 However, the state court could reasonably find that Petitioner was not prejudiced by  
30 introduction of the photos or failure of defense counsel to object to them. The Court agrees with  
31

1 the state court reasoning in finding the photographs relevant and probative of charges and  
2 elements including intent to kill, aggravation and penalty.

3 Nor does the failure to object necessarily demonstrate ineffective assistance. See Nefstad  
4 v. Baldwin, 66 F.3d 335 at \*3 (9th Cir. 1995) (holding no violation of due process where  
5 prosecutor during closing argument shows photographs of victim before and after murder  
6 because relevant to intent).

7 Even without the photographs, it is not reasonably probable the jury would have returned  
8 a sentence less than death given the evidence in aggravation including the circumstances  
9 surrounding the murders of the Bocanegras and Mr. Tatman, and Petitioner's 1982 assaults on  
10 Ammarie and Pena. (RT 2863-2874.)

11 Accordingly, the state court could reasonable have found that Petitioner failed to make an  
12 evidentiary showing that defense counsel's performance fell below an objective standard of  
13 reasonableness and that, but for counsel's unprofessional errors, the result of the proceeding  
14 would have been different. Strickland, 466 U.S., at 687-694.

15 It follows that the state court rejection of the claim was neither contrary to, or an  
16 unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law, nor based on an unreasonable  
17 determination of the facts in light of the evidence presented in the state court proceeding. See 28  
18 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

19 Claim 45 is denied.

20 **e. Review of Claim 46**

21 Petitioner next claims ineffective assistance by failure to contest prosecution evidence of  
22 lack of remorse.

23 The California Supreme Court summarily denied claim 46 (SPet. Claim OO) raised in  
24 Petitioner's state petition for habeas corpus. In re Sanchez, S049502 (DD). In this case, "the  
25 habeas petitioner's burden still must be met by showing there was no reasonable basis for the  
26 state court to deny relief," Richter, 562 U.S. at 98, and this Court "must determine what  
27 arguments or theories supported or . . . could have supported, the state court's decision; and then  
28

1 it must ask whether it is possible fair-minded jurists could disagree that those arguments or  
2 theories are inconsistent with the holding in a prior decision of this Court.” Id. (emphasis  
3 added).

4 Petitioner alleges that he was prejudiced by Boggs’s false testimony attributing to  
5 Petitioner the lack of remorse shown by Reyes following the Tatman murder, i.e., that Reyes and  
6 Petitioner “kicked back, drank some whiskey, smoked some dope, ate some food, and just  
7 relaxed for the rest of the evening.” (RT 2663-64; SPet. Ex. 100.) An error that Ryals also made  
8 in her opening argument. (RT 2619.) Petitioner faults his counsel for failure to cross-examine  
9 Boggs, and failure to introduce evidence of Petitioner’s remorse expressed to reporter Trihey and  
10 his friends Robin and Debbie Lozano.

11 The Court is not persuaded by this claim. Petitioner’s contention regarding to Boggs’s  
12 allegedly false testimony and defense counsel’s failure to cross-examine Boggs on this issue fails  
13 substantively for reasons discussed in claim 37, i.e., the state court could reasonably have  
14 concluded that prosecutor Ryals did not know of and knowingly rely upon Boggs’s erroneous  
15 testimony, (SPet. Exhs. 137, p. 12; 113, p.10; SResp. Ex. B), and there is no reasonable  
16 likelihood the error affected the result of trial or caused an unfair trial.

17 Petitioner also alleges prejudice from Ryals’s opening argument in which she made  
18 reference to Boggs’s errant testimony. Under California law, the absence or presence of remorse  
19 is a factor relevant to the jury’s penalty determination. People v. Ghent, 43 Cal.3d 739, 771  
20 (1987); see also Harris v. Pulley, 885 F.2d 1354, 1384 (9th Cir. 1988). The prosecutor’s  
21 comment is impermissible only where it is “manifestly intended to call attention to the  
22 defendant’s failure to testify or is of such a character that the jury would naturally and necessarily  
23 take it to be a comment on the failure to testify.” Beardslee v. Woodford, 358 F.3d 560, 586 (9th  
24 Cir. 2003). Here the prosecution evidence of lack of remorse did not refer to Petitioner’s failure  
25 to testify, but rather to statements that were already in evidence.

26 Additionally, there is not a reasonable probability that statements of remorse to Trihey  
27 and acquaintances, the Lozanos, even if taken as admissible evidence of remorse, could have  
28

1 affected the jury's imposition of the death penalty. Statements of remorse to Trihey were  
2 themselves inculpating. (SPet. Ex. 113, p. 12.) Moreover, a lack of remorse is in any event  
3 suggested by Petitioner's statements describing Mr. Tatman's murder and robbery, his intention  
4 to rob Mr. Tatman, how Reyes stabbed Mr. Tatman, and how Petitioner and Reyes then took Mr.  
5 Tatman's things back to their room. (RT 2658-2666.) Tactical reasons for not presenting  
6 remorse evidence are reasonably suggested by hearsay issues relating to Petitioner's proffer (Pet.  
7 719) and the defense strategy to not admit guilt but rather focus on "residual or lingering doubt."  
8 (SPet. Ex. 113, pp. 8-12.)

9 The state court could have reasonably believed that Petitioner's confession to Boggs of  
10 the circumstances surrounding Tatman's murder and Petitioner's involvement in it would have  
11 undercut any sympathy toward him by the jury. (See RT 2658-2666.) Moreover, defense  
12 counsel could reasonably have decided that a lingering doubt defense and mitigating social  
13 history might well have been weakened by evidence of remorse. (See RT 3053-3055, 3063-  
14 3064.)

15 The Court finds that Petitioner has not established that defense counsel's performance fell  
16 below an objective standard of reasonableness and that, but for counsel's unprofessional errors,  
17 the result of the proceeding would have been different. Strickland, 466 U.S., at 687-694.

18 For the reasons stated, a fair-minded jurist could have found that Petitioner failed to  
19 establish that the state court rejection of the claim was contrary to, or an unreasonable  
20 application of, clearly established federal law, or an or an unreasonable determination of the  
21 facts in light of the evidence presented in the state court proceeding, viewed most favoring the  
22 prosecution. Jackson, 443 U.S. at 319. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

23 Claim 46 is denied.

24 **f. Review of Claim 47**

25 Petitioner next claims ineffective assistance by counsel's failure to investigate and  
26 present mitigation evidence regarding the 1982 Ammarie and Pena Crimes.

27 The California Supreme Court summarily denied claim 47 (SPet. Claim PP) raised in  
28

1 Petitioner's state petition for habeas corpus. In re Sanchez, S049502 (DD). In this case, "the  
2 habeas petitioner's burden still must be met by showing there was no reasonable basis for the  
3 state court to deny relief," Richter, 562 U.S. at 98, and this Court "must determine what  
4 arguments or theories supported or . . . could have supported, the state court's decision; and then  
5 it must ask whether it is possible fair-minded jurists could disagree that those arguments or  
6 theories are inconsistent with the holding in a prior decision of this Court." Id. (emphasis  
7 added).

8 The trial record reveals Mr. Ammarie, the store keeper victim in one incident, testified at  
9 the penalty phase that, on May 7, 1982, Petitioner assaulted him when Ammarie refused to "get  
10 [Petitioner] some bacon." Petitioner stabbed Ammarie in the left shoulder and neck, took money  
11 and ran away, leaving Ammarie in the hospital for two weeks. (RT 2862-2866; see Sanchez, 12  
12 Cal.4th at 22.) The victim in the other incident, Mr. Pena, a friend of and Petitioner, testified at  
13 the penalty phase that Petitioner, without any provocation, stabbed him three times with a  
14 kitchen knife and demanded money, leaving Pena hospitalized for two days. (RT 2868-74.)

15 Petitioner contends that, as to the Ammarie and Pena crimes, defense counsel failed to  
16 investigate and present mitigating evidence of Petitioner's emotional and family turmoil,  
17 possible PCP psychosis, organic brain damage, and belief he acted in self-defense in these  
18 incidents. Petitioner claims there was no tactical reason for these omissions.

19 The Court finds this claim unavailing. Petitioner does not offer facts showing the nature  
20 and extent of the investigation conducted by defense counsel Frank, or what information if any,  
21 Petitioner provided to defense counsel Frank in preparation for the penalty phase, or what  
22 Petitioner did, if anything, to cooperate in developing mitigating penalty phase evidence. As the  
23 Supreme Court stated in Strickland, the information supplied by the defendant is "critical" in  
24 determining whether counsel's investigation decisions are reasonable. 466 U.S. at 691. Counsel  
25 is "strongly presumed" to make decisions in the exercise of professional judgment. Id. at 690.

26 Petitioner faults defense counsel Frank for failure to consult with counsel who assisted  
27 Petitioner in the 1982 criminal proceedings. Yet Petitioner does not state what credible,  
28

1 probative mitigating information this consultation would have yielded over and above the police  
2 and court records relating to the 1982 convictions, which Petitioner concedes defense counsel  
3 undertook to obtain. (SHCP Exhs. 137, ¶ 35; 113, ¶ 30.)

4 Petitioner faults defense counsel's for a failure to investigate possible social and mental  
5 defenses contemporaneous to the 1982 crimes, including probable effects of alleged heavy PCP  
6 use. Petitioner offers in support the 1995 opinion of a clinical psychologist, Jeri Doane, as to the  
7 effect of losses and turmoil in his personal life (SPet. Ex. 105, pp. 75-78), as well as anecdotal  
8 assertions of Petitioner and others regarding potential mental and other defenses to his 1982  
9 criminal conduct. (SPet. Exhs. 105, pp. 1-5, 79-82, 99- 100; 802; 506, pp.6-8; 128, p. 2.)

10 But even assuming this type of mitigating information could be competent evidence, it  
11 does not suggest Petitioner informed defense counsel in this proceeding of the existence of this  
12 mitigating information, or that defense counsel in this proceeding was otherwise aware of it or  
13 should have been aware of it. Moreover, defense counsel Frank could reasonably have believed  
14 such information, if developed, would have little if any mitigating value. Petitioner does not  
15 dispute that he was convicted of the 1982 crimes. *Post hac* assertion of defenses to convictions  
16 suffered years prior could reasonably be found to have little if any mitigating value. As to  
17 mental defenses, the lack of supporting evidence (see claim 6), and the fact that Petitioner was  
18 convicted for these 1982 offenses, could reasonably suggest further investigation was  
19 unwarranted. Based on the evidentiary record, defense counsel could reasonably presume viable  
20 defenses in the 1982 proceedings were raised therein.

21 These defenses would not advance defense counsel Frank's tactic of lingering doubt.  
22 "Rare are the situations in which the 'wide latitude counsel must have in making tactical  
23 decisions' will be limited to any one technique or approach." Richter, 131 S. Ct. at 789 (quoting  
24 Strickland, 466 U.S. at 689); see also Williams, 529 U.S. at 415 (O'Connor, J., concurring)  
25 (defense counsel conducted a reasonable investigation into Petitioner's troubling background and  
26 unique personal circumstances developed a coherent and organized strategy, proffered evidence,  
27 and presented a case for mitigation); Wiggins, 539 U.S. at 521 (citing Strickland, 466 U.S. at

1 688) (“the proper measure of attorney performance remains simply reasonableness under  
2 prevailing professional norms.”).

3 Just as the Supreme Court found in Van Hook,

4 This is not a case in which the defendant's attorney [] failed to act while  
5 potentially powerful mitigating evidence stared [him] in the face, *cf. Wiggins*, 539  
6 U.S., at 525, 123 S. Ct. 2527, or would have been apparent from documents any  
7 reasonable attorney would have obtained, *cf. Rompilla v. Beard*, 545 U.S. 374,  
8 389–393, 125 S. Ct. 2456, 162 L.Ed.2d 360 (2005). It is instead a case, like  
Strickland itself, in which defense counsel's “decision not to seek more”  
mitigating evidence from the defendant's background “than was already in hand”  
fell “well within the range of professionally reasonable judgments.”

9 Bobby v. Van Hook, 558 U.S. 4, 11–12 (2009) (*quoting Strickland*, 466 U.S. at 699).

10 Additionally, even if defense counsel Frank's investigation and presentation relating to  
11 the 1982 crimes was deficient, there was no reasonable probability such mitigation evidence  
12 could have affected the jury's imposition of the death penalty given the noted substantial  
13 evidence against Petitioner. The state court could reasonably have concluded that defense  
14 counsel's investigation was adequate given the above noted facts underlying these prior criminal  
15 convictions, defense counsel Frank's theory of lingering doubt and the social and personal  
16 history mitigation evidence discussed in claims 6, 26, *ante*.

17 For these reasons, Petitioner has failed to overcome the strong presumption that counsel  
18 made decisions in the exercise of professional judgment. Strickland, 466 U.S. at 690. Even if  
19 defense counsel had discovered this evidence and still chose to proceed with his strategy as  
20 opposed to the strategy Petitioner now advocates, a fair-minded jurist could conclude that his  
21 decision was reasonable. “Counsel was entitled to formulate a strategy that was reasonable at the  
22 time and to balance limited resources in accord with effective trial tactics and strategies.”  
23 Richter, 562 U.S. at 107. “[T]he Sixth Amendment guarantees reasonable competence, not  
24 perfect advocacy judged with the benefit of hindsight.” Yarborough, 540 U.S. at 8.

25 Petitioner fails to demonstrate that no reasonable jurist could have found that he failed to  
26 make a *prima facie* showing that defense counsel rendered ineffective assistance during the  
27 penalty phase of the trial relating to mitigating the 1982 criminal convictions.

1 For the reasons stated, a fair-minded jurist could have found that the state court rejection  
2 of this claim was neither contrary to, or an unreasonable application of, clearly established  
3 federal law, as determined by the Supreme Court, nor an unreasonable determination of the facts  
4 in light of the evidence presented in the state court proceeding. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

5 Claim 47 is denied.

6 **g. Review of Claim 48**

7 Petitioner next claims ineffective assistance by counsel's failure to fully and completely  
8 develop and present adequate and reliable evidence about Petitioner's character, background, and  
9 behavior.

10 The California Supreme Court summarily denied claim 48 (SPet. Claim QQ) raised in  
11 Petitioner's state petition for habeas corpus. In re Sanchez, S049502 (DD). In this case, "the  
12 habeas petitioner's burden still must be met by showing there was no reasonable basis for the  
13 state court to deny relief," Richter, 562 U.S. at 98, and this Court "must determine what  
14 arguments or theories supported or . . . could have supported, the state court's decision; and then  
15 it must ask whether it is possible fair-minded jurists could disagree that those arguments or  
16 theories are inconsistent with the holding in a prior decision of this Court." Id. (emphasis  
17 added).

18 Petitioner, citing to facts alleged in claim 6, contends that background and character  
19 testimony from four family members as well as social anthropologist Isabel Wright did not fully  
20 present evidence of his unstable family life, sporadic education, disabling physical violence,  
21 abuse, deprivation, and emotional suffering of his childhood and adolescence his caring for  
22 siblings and heavy drug use. He alleges that defense counsel Frank, consistent with Wright's  
23 requests, should have presented a full social history prepared by a social anthropologist, along  
24 with evidence of organic brain damage and psychiatric disorders prepared by a psychologist or  
25 psychiatrist, such as included with his state petition. (SHCP Exhs. 105, 111, 114.)

26 During the sentence selection stage, the Supreme Court has imposed a requirement that  
27 the jury make "an *individualized* determination on the basis of the character of the individual and  
28

1 the circumstances of the crime.” Tuilaepa, 512 U.S. at 972-73 (citing Zant, 462 U.S. at 879, and  
2 Woodson v. North Carolina, 428 U.S. 280, 303-304 (1976)). This “requirement is met when the  
3 jury can consider relevant mitigating evidence of the character and record of the defendant and  
4 the circumstances of the crime.” Id. (citing Blystone v. Pennsylvania, 494 U.S. 299, 307 (1990))  
5 (“requirement of individualized sentencing in capital cases is satisfied by allowing the jury to  
6 consider all relevant mitigating evidence”). The court may not “impede [] the sentencing jury's  
7 ability to carry out its task of considering all relevant facets of the character and record of the  
8 individual offender” by excluding “relevant mitigating evidence.” Skipper v. South Carolina,  
9 476 U.S. 1, 8 (1986). Nevertheless, the court retains “the traditional authority of a court to  
10 exclude, as irrelevant, evidence not bearing on the defendant's character, prior record, or the  
11 circumstances of his offense.” Lockett v. Ohio, 438 U.S. 586, 605 n.12 (1978).

12 The Court does not find that Petitioner was prejudiced by any failure of defense counsel  
13 to develop and present complete, adequate, and reliable evidence of Petitioner's character,  
14 background, and behavior at the time of the Bocanegra and Tatman homicides.

15 Defense counsel Frank, while arguing for life without the possibility of parole, (RT 2895-  
16 2896, 2910, 2923, 2928, 3021), did present the following significant mitigating background and  
17 character evidence from family members including Petitioner's wife and retained social  
18 anthropologist Dr. Wright. (RT 2897, 2912, 2928, 2930, 3007-3008, 3017.) Petitioner's mother  
19 became pregnant with him when she was fifteen. (RT 2897-2898, 2943-2945.) His mother  
20 turned to alcohol and drugs (2899-2900, 2902-2903) and embarked upon a succession of  
21 unstable and unsupportive marriages and relationships. Petitioner experienced an impoverished,  
22 nomadic, neglected and sometimes abusive upbringing with little positive parental or adult  
23 supervision. (RT 2902-2941, 2958-2964, 3003-3006.) He lived in a car and then cheap motels.  
24 (RT 2904, 2908, 2918-2919.) His parents drank and argued, (RT 2905, 2909), and sometimes  
25 physically abused Petitioner (RT 2907, 2985.) His siblings were removed from the home for  
26 adoption. (RT 2913-2914, 2941, 2970, 2978-83.) His lack of stability in school, changing  
27 schools often and infrequently attending class, resulted in poor academic performance such that  
28

1 he did not progress beyond the eighth grade. (RT 2963-2969, 2941-2942, 2980, 2991-2994.) He  
2 began sniffing paint as a teen. (RT 2993, 2998.) His attempts at job training and employment  
3 (RT 2996-2997) were short-lived because of his lack of skills and education. (RT 3003-3004.)

4 Defense Counsel Frank presented evidence that Petitioner nonetheless showed concern  
5 and care for his siblings, sometimes stealing food for them. (RT 2920.) Petitioner's  
6 grandmother, to whom he was close, died in 1982 (RT 3000). Petitioner's mother died from  
7 alcohol related complications at age thirty-eight while he was in prison for the 1982 Ammarie  
8 and Pena stabbings. (RT 2897, 2912, 2916, 3001.) Petitioner's step-father also died from  
9 complication of alcohol. (RT 2919, 2961.) Petitioner lived a transient existence after his release  
10 from prison in 1986. (RT 3001-3002.) Petitioner was unable to find work and resorted to drugs.  
11 (Id.) Petitioner married Robin Alvarado shortly before his 1988 homicide trial, (RT 2925, 2928),  
12 and prior to that cared for her children. (RT 2927, 3000, 3018-3019.) Social anthropologist, Dr.  
13 Wright, testified that the major influences in Petitioner's life were his migratory lifestyle  
14 secondary to poverty and inconsistent family relationships. (RT 2939, 3003, 3006.)

15 The evidentiary record demonstrates defense counsel argued all the foregoing in urging  
16 the jury to return a life sentence without the possibility of parole for the then twenty-five year old  
17 Petitioner. (RT 2895-2896, 2910, 2923, 2928, 3021.) Moreover, prosecutor Ryals, in her  
18 argument to the jury, acknowledged there were mitigating factors in Petitioner's background and  
19 character that evoked sympathy for him. (RT 3043-3047, 3079.)

20 The Court finds that, given the substantial inculpatory evidence against Petitioner, it is  
21 not reasonably probable that Petitioner would have received a more favorable sentence had  
22 further evidence of his background, character and behavior been presented. In particular,  
23 presentation of additional evidence regarding Petitioner's substance abuse would not have  
24 necessarily added weight to his case for mitigation. See Cullen, 131 S. Ct. at 1410 (noting that  
25 evidence of serious substance abuse is "by no means clearly mitigating"); id. at 1406-07 (noting  
26 that Strickland "rejected the notion that the same investigation will be required in every case"  
27 and requires the habeas court to strongly presume that counsel exercised reasonable judgment in

1 making all significant decisions).

2 The state court could reasonably find Petitioner's alleged neurological and psychiatric  
3 conditions and related mental defenses were not sufficiently supported by the record and failed  
4 for reasons discussed in claims 6 and 26, *ante*.

5 Petitioner has not established that defense counsel's performance fell below an objective  
6 standard of reasonableness and that, but for counsel's unprofessional errors, the result of the  
7 proceeding would have been different. Strickland, 466 U.S., at 687-694.

8 For the reasons stated, a fair-minded jurist could have found that Petitioner failed to  
9 establish that the state court rejection of the claim was contrary to, or an unreasonable  
10 application of, clearly established federal law, or an unreasonable determination of the facts in  
11 light of the evidence presented in the state court proceeding, viewed most favoring the  
12 prosecution. Jackson, 443 U.S. at 319. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

13 Claim 48 is denied.

14 **h. Review of Claim 49**

15 Petitioner alleges defense counsel was ineffective by failing to request that the trial court  
16 voir dire prospective jurors about adverse publicity from Bakersfield Californian articles relating  
17 to debarment proceedings against defense counsel Toton.

18 The California Supreme Court summarily denied claim 49 (SPet. Claim RR) raised in  
19 Petitioner's state petition for habeas corpus. In re Sanchez, S049502 (DD).

20 The state supreme court considered and rejected this claim on direct appeal:

21 [I]t is evident from the record that defendant failed to preserve his claim of  
22 improper voir dire by objecting to the court's questioning during trial. [Citation]  
23 On the merits, our review of the record shows the trial court's voir dire adequately  
24 insured an impartial jury, without unnecessarily exposing the jury to the very  
information defendant found could prejudice his case . . . .

25 The trial court assisted counsel and to ensure a fair and impartial jury by requiring  
26 the 201 prospective jurors to fill out a one-page questionnaire asking the panel  
27 members whether they had ever heard of the case, and if so, to name their source.  
[Citation] Of the jurors eventually selected to serve, eight told the court they had  
28 never heard of defendant's case, were not familiar with counsel, and either did not  
subscribe to or did not read on a consistent basis the Bakersfield Californian. In  
addition, pursuant to further questioning by the court, four of these jurors

1 indicated they did not believe everything they read in the newspaper.

2 Two other jurors who acknowledged they read the Bakersfield Californian  
3 observed that they had never heard of defendant's case.

4 Two of the twelve jurors selected had prior knowledge of defendant's case, but  
5 their voir dire responses clearly indicated that their exposure to the newspaper  
6 articles about defendant's case was limited to an awareness of the general facts  
7 and circumstances of the Bocanegra and Tatman murders. Their knowledge of the  
8 case did not include any specific information regarding Toton's pending  
9 disbarment. Thus, it appears that the trial court acted well within its discretion in  
proposing the general question of the jurors' knowledge of Toton's pending  
disbarment without unnecessarily educating the jury about that matter. The trial  
court's strategy thus avoided informing the jury of Toton's troubles, while  
assuring defendant a fair and impartial jury. [Citation] Under these facts, we find  
the trial court did not err in limiting voir dire to general questions concerning  
pretrial publicity. [Citation]

10 Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 61-63. The record demonstrates that defense counsel Toton agreed,  
11 reasoning that questioning jurors about the publicity was likely to be more prejudicial than that  
12 publicity itself. (SHCP Ex. 137, ¶ 29). This Court finds the tactic not unreasonable.

13 The Sixth Amendment secures to criminal defendants the right to trial by an impartial  
14 jury. Skilling, 561 U.S. at 377-78; Irvin, 366 U.S. at 722. Nevertheless, "juror impartiality, we  
15 have reiterated, does not require ignorance." Skilling, 561 U.S. at 381 (citing Irvin, 366 U.S. at  
16 722) (jurors are not required to be "totally ignorant of the facts and issues involved."). To merit  
17 relief for violation of his due process rights due to pretrial publicity, Petitioner must demonstrate  
18 that the case is one in which prejudice is presumed, or he must demonstrate actual prejudice.  
19 Skilling, 561 U.S. at 379, 385.

20 "A presumption of prejudice . . . attends only the extreme case." Id. at 381. The  
21 Supreme Court has determined that pretrial publicity so manifestly tainted a criminal prosecution  
22 that prejudice must be presumed in only three cases: Rideau v. Louisiana, 373 U.S. 723, 726-27  
23 (1963) (televised confession); Estes v. Texas, 381 U.S. 532, 536 (1965) (massive pretrial media  
24 interference); and Sheppard v. Maxwell, 384 U.S. 333, 355-356 (1966) (months of virulent  
25 pretrial publicity).

26 "To establish actual prejudice, the defendant must demonstrate that the jurors exhibited  
27 actual partiality or hostility that could not be laid aside." United States v. Sherwood, 98 F.3d

1 402, 410 (9th Cir. 1996). When pretrial publicity is at issue, “primary reliance on the judgment  
2 of the trial court makes [especially] good sense” because the judge “sits in the locale where the  
3 publicity is said to have had its effect” and may base her evaluation on her “own perception of  
4 the depth and extent of news stories that might influence a juror.” Mu'Min, 500 U.S., at 427.  
5 Appellate courts making after-the-fact assessments of the media's impact on jurors should be  
6 mindful that their judgments lack the on-the-spot comprehension of the situation possessed by  
7 trial judges. Skilling, 561 U.S. at 386.

8 Petitioner contends that neither the trial court nor defense counsel asked prospective  
9 jurors about newspaper the articles appearing in the Bakersfield Californian two weeks before  
10 jury selection that discussed the impending debarment of lead defense counsel Toton. He  
11 maintains there was no tactical reason for not questioning jurors about these newspaper articles  
12 and that jurors prejudiced thereby may have been empaneled.

13 Petitioner's case is immediately distinguishable from Estes and Sheppard. He does not  
14 allege, nor is there any evidence, that media coverage of attorney disciplinary proceedings  
15 interfered with his right to a fair trial. See Skilling, 561 U.S. at 382 n.14 (“Skilling's reliance on  
16 Estes and Sheppard is particularly misplaced; those cases involved media interference with  
17 courtroom proceedings during trial. [Citation] Skilling does not assert that news coverage  
18 reached and influenced his jury after it was empaneled.”). Rideau is the only case in which the  
19 Supreme Court overturned a conviction based on pretrial publicity.

20 Petitioner's case also is readily distinguished from Rideau. See Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at  
21 61-63. Here, during voir dire, the following eight jurors indicated they had never heard of the  
22 case, did not know counsel, and did not subscribe to and did not usually read the Bakersfield  
23 Californian: juror Jones (CT 258; RT 594, 596-597, 606); juror Mooney (CT 256, RT 647, 664);  
24 juror Roberts (CT 237, RT 1170); juror Stell (CT 184, RT 1882); juror G. Clark (CT 229, RT  
25 2120); juror P. Clark (CT 228; RT 2140-2141); juror O'Toole (CT 220, RT 2401-2402, 2406);  
26 and juror Raymond (CT 217, RT 2438-2439).

27 Two jurors, Crowder and Zamora, regularly read the Bakersfield Californian but were  
28

1 unaware of the case and of counsel. (CT 207; RT 1342-1343 regarding juror Crowder; CT 213;  
2 RT 2554, 2563 regarding juror Zamora.)

3 Only two of the jurors selected, Razo and Rodriguez, stated they had heard of the case.  
4 (RT 1814-1815; 2458-2460, 2471-2472.) Neither of these jurors mentioned having hearing of  
5 Toton; both indicated they did not believe everything they read in newspapers and could put  
6 what they had heard out of mind while deliberating. *Id.* Petitioner has not made an evidentiary  
7 showing that these juror statements were untrue.

8 “[P]retrial publicity—even pervasive, adverse publicity—does not inevitably lead to an  
9 unfair trial.” Nebraska Press Assn. v. Stuart, 427 U.S. 539, 554 (1976). In the rare case that  
10 prejudice is presumed, there will have been a “‘barrage of inflammatory publicity immediately  
11 prior to trial,’ [Citation], amounting to a ‘huge . . . wave of public passion.’” Patton v. Yount,  
12 467 U.S. 1025, 1033 (1984) (quoting Murphy v. Florida, 421 U.S. 794, 798 (1975) and Irvin,  
13 366 U.S. at 728). The coverage in this case was neither all pervasive nor constant leading up to  
14 trial. Certainly there was no barrage of inflammatory publicity immediately prior to trial or in  
15 the six months leading up to trial. Based on the foregoing, the state court reasonably could have  
16 concluded that this was not an extreme case wherein prejudice should be presumed from pretrial  
17 publicity.

18 As discussed above and in claim 55, *post*, the trial judge considered the impact of pretrial  
19 publicity on the jurors who served on Petitioner’s case. None of the twelve selected jurors had  
20 been exposed to media accounts of Toton’s disciplinary problems. Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 61-63.  
21 Only two jurors had heard of the case. *Id.* It is well-established that “juror impartiality . . . does  
22 not require ignorance.” Skilling, 561 U.S. at 381 (citing Irvin, 366 U.S. at 722) (Jurors are not  
23 required to be “totally ignorant of the facts and issues involved”; “scarcely any of those best  
24 qualified to serve as jurors will not have formed some impression or opinion as to the merits of  
25 the case.”); Reynolds, 98 U.S. at 155–156 (“[E]very case of public interest is almost, as a matter  
26 of necessity, brought to the attention of all the intelligent people in the vicinity, and scarcely any  
27 one can be found among those best fitted for jurors who has not read or heard of it, and who has

1 not some impression or some opinion in respect to its merits.”).

2 Petitioner’s suggestion that the manner in which Toton conducted voir dire was self-  
3 interested is unsupported by the evidence for reasons discussed in claims 21-24, *ante*. Moreover,  
4 even if defense counsel’s failure to request voir dire about attorney discipline publicity was  
5 deficient performance, nothing in the evidentiary record suggests presumed or actual prejudice.  
6 The noted substantial evidence against Petitioner suggested no reasonable probability of a more  
7 favorable outcome even had defense counsel requested voir dire about publicity from Toton’s  
8 disciplinary proceeding.

9 The state court could reasonably have concluded that Petitioner failed to establish that  
10 defense counsel’s performance fell below an objective standard of reasonableness and that, but  
11 for counsel’s unprofessional errors, the result of the proceeding would have been different.  
12 Strickland, 466 U.S., at 687-694. For the reasons above, this Court agrees with the state court  
13 that there was no reasonable likelihood that Petitioner did not receive a fair trial despite the  
14 limited voir dire regarding pretrial publicity.

15 Accordingly, the state court’s rejection of this claim was not contrary to, or an  
16 unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law, or an unreasonable determination of  
17 the facts in light of the evidence presented in the state court proceeding, viewed most favoring  
18 the prosecution. Jackson, 443 U.S. at 319. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

19 Claim 49 is denied.

20 **i. Review of Claim 50**

21 Petitioner next claims ineffective assistance by counsel’s failure to object to prosecutorial  
22 misconduct during closing argument.

23 The California Supreme Court summarily denied claim 50 (SPet. Claim SS) raised in  
24 Petitioner’s state petition for habeas corpus. In re Sanchez, S049502 (DD).

25 That court also considered and rejected the claim on direct appeal, finding that:

26  
27 In his closing argument, co-counsel Frank consistently pointed out the  
28 prosecution’s inaccurate statements to the jury, reminding it of the evidence  
presented. Counsel’s performance in demonstrating for the jury the prosecutor’s

1       improper argument reveals counsel's attention to detail rather than incompetence.  
2       Counsel's careful references during the prosecutor's misstatements demonstrates  
3       that defense counsel was aware of the misstatements and, in exercising reasonable  
4       professional judgment, chose not to object for tactical reasons. In any event, we  
5       find no reasonable probability that defense counsel's failure to object prejudiced  
6       defendant's case.

7       Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 71.

8       Petitioner faults defense counsel's failure to object when prosecutor Ryals argued in  
9       closing that Petitioner killed Mr. Tatman, suggesting the jury was sentencing Petitioner for the  
10       Tatman homicide, and argued that the Bocanegras would not have been killed but for the actions  
11       of Petitioner.

12       However, the state court, based on the record before it, could have found it reasonable for  
13       the defense not to object in such circumstances. (See claim 42; see also Flieger v. Delo, 16 F.3d  
14       878, 886 (8th Cir. 1994) (reasonable trial strategies do not amount to ineffective assistance even  
15       where unsuccessful)).

16       The Tatman conviction was presented to the jury as evidence in aggravation and the jury  
17       appropriately admonished and instructed in this regard. Prosecution argument that Petitioner had  
18       a principal role in the Tatman killing, and that the Bocanegras would not have been killed  
19       without his assistance, did not in all reasonable likelihood mislead the jury or affect the death  
20       sentence imposed. The weight of evidence against Petitioner as an aider and abettor of the  
21       homicides was substantial. Evidence showed that Petitioner grabbed and held Mr. Bocanegra  
22       while Joey got a knife (RT 2843, 2853-54); that Petitioner beat Mr. Bocanegra while Joey  
23       stabbed him (RT 2696-2706, 2719-21, 2725, 2843-44, 2854, 2858); that Petitioner rushed Mrs.  
24       Bocanegra and told Joey to "shut her up" (RT 2844, 2858); that Petitioner pushed Mrs.  
25       Bocanegra into a back room and hit her on the head with a bar while Joey stabbed her (RT 2710-  
26       14, 2720-21, 2725, 2752, 2844), and that while this occurred Mrs. Bocanegra's hands were  
27       bound and she was likely gagged (RT 2708, 2723, 2749-51, 2754-55, 2774-2775).

28       Moreover, the jury certainly was made well aware that Mr. Tatman's stabbing wounds  
29       were non-fatal injuries and that Petitioner's conviction for Mr. Tatman's murder was based on

1 his aiding and abetting Reyes. (Id.; RT 2693-94.) Generally, counsel are “given latitude in the  
2 presentation of their closing arguments, and courts must allow the prosecution to strike hard  
3 blows based on the evidence presented and all reasonable inferences therefrom.” Ceja, 97 F.3d  
4 at 1253–1254 (quoting Baker, 10 F.3d at 1415).

5 Petitioner has not made a sufficient showing he was prejudiced by defense counsel’s  
6 failure to object to alleged prosecutorial misconduct during closing argument. The evidence  
7 against Petitioner was not insubstantial considering the multiple murder special circumstance in  
8 the Bocanegra murders and the substantial evidence in aggravation presented during the penalty  
9 phase. There is no reasonably likelihood the outcome would have been different absent the  
10 alleged prosecutorial misconduct. See Donnelly, 416 U.S. at 643 (improper jury argument by the  
11 state does not present a claim of constitutional magnitude unless it is so prejudicial that the  
12 petitioner’s trial was fundamentally unfair . . . [t]o establish prejudice, the petitioner must  
13 demonstrate either persistent and pronounced misconduct or that the evidence was so  
14 insubstantial that, in all probability, but for the remarks, no conviction would have occurred).

15 The state court could reasonably have concluded that Petitioner failed to establish that  
16 defense counsel’s performance fell below an objective standard of reasonableness and that, but  
17 for counsel’s unprofessional errors, the result of the proceeding would have been different.  
18 Strickland, 466 U.S., at 687-694.

19 Accordingly, the state court’s rejection of this claim was not contrary to, or an  
20 unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law, or an unreasonable determination of  
21 the facts in light of the evidence presented in the state court proceeding, viewed most favoring  
22 the prosecution. Jackson, 443 U.S. at 319. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

23 Claim 50 is denied.

24 **j. Review of Claim 51**

25 In his next claim, Petitioner alleges ineffective assistance by counsel during penalty  
26 phase closing Argument.

27 The California Supreme Court summarily denied claim 51 (SPet. Claim TT) raised in  
28

1 Petitioner's state petition for habeas corpus. In re Sanchez, S049502 (DD). In this case, "the  
2 habeas petitioner's burden still must be met by showing there was no reasonable basis for the  
3 state court to deny relief," Richter, 562 U.S. at 98, and this Court "must determine what  
4 arguments or theories supported or . . . could have supported, the state court's decision; and then  
5 it must ask whether it is possible fair-minded jurists could disagree that those arguments or  
6 theories are inconsistent with the holding in a prior decision of this Court." Id. (emphasis  
7 added).

8 Generally, counsel are "given latitude in the presentation of their closing arguments, and  
9 courts must allow the prosecution to strike hard blows based on the evidence presented and all  
10 reasonable inferences therefrom." Ceja, 97 F.3d at 1253–1254 (quoting Baker, 10 F.3d at 1415);  
11 see also Molina, 934 F.2d at 1445 (prosecutor has wide latitude during closing argument to make  
12 reasonable inferences based on the evidence).

13 Petitioner contends that defense counsel's closing argument failed to respond to the  
14 prosecutor's improper argument regarding Petitioner's involvement in the Tatman and  
15 Bocanegra homicides. To this end, Petitioner repeats his allegations in claims 7, 42 and 50, *ante*,  
16 that defense counsel failed to point out evidence discrediting prosecution informant Hernandez  
17 (RT 2842, 2847-2848, 3051), and that Petitioner never told Hernandez that he (Petitioner) had  
18 stabbed anyone, (RT 2847-2848), and that he (Petitioner) did not inflict the fatal stab wounds  
19 upon the Bocanegras, (RT 2846), and that he (Petitioner) had no robbery motive. (RT 2852.)  
20 Nonetheless, for the reasons stated in claims 7, 42 and 50, the state court could reasonably have  
21 found that the performance of defense counsel was not deficient and did not prejudice the  
22 outcome of trial proceedings.

23 The trial judge appropriately admonished the jury that argument is not evidence. As to  
24 the evidence, the state court could reasonably have found it weighed substantially against the  
25 Petitioner as an aider and abettor of the homicides. The murders occurred about one month after  
26 Petitioner's release from prison for the 1982 assaults. (RT 2877-2879 2973-2974.) The evidence  
27 reasonably showed that Petitioner grabbed and held Mr. Bocanegra while Joey got a knife (RT  
28

1 2843-2854), beat Mr. Bocanegra while Joey stabbed him (RT 2696-2706, 2719-2721, 2725,  
2 2843-2844, 2854, 2858), rushed Mrs. Bocanegra and told Joey to “shut her up” (RT 2844, 2858),  
3 pushed Mrs. Bocanegra into a back room while Joey stabbed her, hitting her on the head with a  
4 bar (RT 2710-2714, 2720-2721, 2725, 2752, 2844), and that Mrs. Bocanegra’s hands were bound  
5 and she was likely gagged (RT 2708, 2723, 2749-2751, 2754-2755, 2774-2775).

6 The state court also could have reasonably determined there was no basis upon which  
7 Petitioner could have effectively impeached Hernandez. Petitioner has not shown that  
8 Hernandez gave contradictory, inconsistent or false testimony, or that Hernandez was motivated  
9 by an undisclosed plea bargain. No facts or discrepancies between the testimony and the  
10 physical evidence establish or compel the conclusion that Hernandez, by virtue of his alleged  
11 substance addition, his plea deal, or otherwise, was motivated to and did testify falsely or  
12 inaccurately. (SPet. Ex. 900, pp. 4, 11; SResp. Ex. B.) Having cross-examined Hernandez at the  
13 preliminary hearing, Toton determined on that basis not to interview him. (SPet. Ex. 137, p. 4.)  
14 During cross-examination at the guilt and special circumstance phase, Hernandez’s testimony  
15 was consistent with Petitioner’s statements and the physical evidence that he had not been  
16 offered any disposition of then pending criminal matters prior to agreeing to testify at the  
17 Petitioner prosecution. (CT 576-577.) During cross-examination at the penalty phase,  
18 Hernandez admitted a deal on a then pending charge in exchange for his testimony in Petitioner.  
19 (RT 2850-2851.) Petitioner has not demonstrated that Hernandez’s testimony was false or  
20 misleading, or that defense counsel acted unreasonably in not interviewing Hernandez.

21 Petitioner goes on to argue that defense counsel failed to explain the Bocanegra and  
22 Tatman evidence and verdicts, and failed to dispel the suggestion Tatman homicide was a capital  
23 crime for which they would sentence Petitioner (RT 3055), and failed to support the “lingering  
24 doubt” defense (RT 3063-3082). Petitioner points out that, as discussed in claim 42, prosecutor  
25 Ryals improperly argued that the jury was to decide whether Petitioner killed Mr. Tatman. (RT  
26 3034-3036.) However, the record reflects that defense counsel pointed out improper argument  
27 and reminded the jury of the evidence presented in favor of the lingering doubt defense. (RT  
28

1 3063-3082.)

2       As with the claims above, the jury was made well aware that Mr. Tatman's stabbing  
3 wounds were non-fatal injuries and that Petitioner's conviction for Mr. Tatman's murder was  
4 based on his aiding and abetting Reyes. (RT 235, 2693-2695.) Defense counsel made his  
5 argument to the jury that Petitioner did not intend to kill Mr. Tatman (CT 109; RT 2695), and the  
6 Bocanegras (CT 479, 500; see SHCP Ex. 419), and that there may have been a third assailant in  
7 the Bocanegra murders. (Pet. Exhs. 121, p. 2; 417, pp. 1-2; SHCP Ex. 137, Att. A.)       Given  
8 Petitioner's desire to plead guilty to the Bocanegra murders, (SPet. Exhs. 520, p. 2; 700), the  
9 unrebutted evidence presented at the penalty phase, the admonitions of the trial judge that  
10 argument is not evidence, and the potential aggravating and mitigating effects of circumstances  
11 surrounding the Tatman murder, it is not reasonably probable that even had defense counsel  
12 further responded to Ms. Ryals's closing statements, a different sentence would have been  
13 returned.

14       Accordingly, it could reasonably be found that the prosecution arguments were not so  
15 prejudicial as to make trial fundamentally unfair. See Donnelly, 416 U.S. at 643 (improper jury  
16 argument by the state does not present a claim of constitutional magnitude unless it is so  
17 prejudicial that the petitioner's trial was fundamentally unfair . . . [t]o establish prejudice, the  
18 petitioner must demonstrate either persistent and pronounced misconduct or that the evidence  
19 was so insubstantial that, in all probability, but for the remarks, no conviction would have  
20 occurred); see also Furman, 190 F.3d at 1006 (rejecting habeas claim where, although some of  
21 prosecutor's arguments were improper, jury was told comments were not evidence, and evidence  
22 against defendant was substantial).

23       The state court could have reasonably concluded that Petitioner failed to establish that  
24 defense counsel's performance fell below an objective standard of reasonableness and that, but  
25 for counsel's unprofessional errors, the result of the proceeding would have been different.  
26 Strickland, 466 U.S., at 687-694.

27       A fair-minded jurist could therefore reasonably conclude that Petitioner failed to  
28

1 establish rejection of the claim was contrary to, or an unreasonable application of, clearly  
2 established federal law, or an or an unreasonable determination of the facts in light of the  
3 evidence presented in the state court proceeding, viewed most favoring the prosecution. Jackson,  
4 443 U.S. at 319. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

5 Claim 51 is denied.

6 **k. Review of Claim 52**

7 Petitioner claims cumulative ineffectiveness during the penalty phase, citing to claims 43-  
8 51, which he contends demonstrate defense counsel's failure to present evidence of Petitioner's  
9 minimal culpability, mitigating factors and defenses to the Tatman and Bocanegra homicides.

10 The California Supreme Court summarily denied claim 52 (SPet. Claim UU) raised in  
11 Petitioner's state petition for habeas corpus. In re Sanchez, S049502 (DD).

12 The California Supreme Court considered this issue on direct appeal and rejected it,  
13 finding that:

14 Defendant claims that in combination, the errors at the penalty phase caused  
15 cumulative prejudice warranting a reversal of penalty. After review of the record,  
16 we disagree. Any prosecutorial misconduct that did occur did not significantly  
influence the fairness of defendant's trial or detrimentally affect the jury's  
determination of the appropriate penalty. [Citation]

17  
18 Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 84.

19 For the reasons discussed in claims 43-51, the state court could reasonably have  
20 determined that Petitioner failed to establish in those claims that defense counsel was ineffective  
21 at penalty phase. These claims are insubstantial when considered cumulatively. See Karterman,  
22 60 F.3d at 580; Rupe, 93 F.3d at 1445.

23 Respondent contends claim 52 is not cognizable because it creates and retroactively  
24 applies a "new rule" of constitutional law within Teague v. Lane, 489 U.S. 288. However, the  
25 Court finds the claim fails not because Petitioner seeks to apply a new rule of criminal procedure  
26 under Teague, but rather on grounds the claim lacks merit for the reasons stated.

27 Accordingly, this Court does not find Petitioner has established that defense counsel's  
28

1 cumulative performance at penalty phase fell below an objective standard of reasonableness and  
2 that, but for counsel's unprofessional errors, the result of the proceeding would have been  
3 different. Strickland, 466 U.S., at 687-694.

4 The state court's rejection of this claim was not contrary to, or an unreasonable  
5 application of, clearly established federal law, or an unreasonable determination of the facts in  
6 light of the evidence presented in the state court proceeding, viewed most favoring the  
7 prosecution. Jackson, 443 U.S. at 319. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

8 Claim 52 is denied.

9 **I. Review of Claim 53**

10 In this claim, Petitioner alleges ineffective assistance of counsel due to conflict of interest  
11 arising from publicity about defense counsel Toton's pending disbarment.

12 The California Supreme Court summarily denied claim 53 (SPet. Claim VV) raised in  
13 Petitioner's state petition for habeas corpus. In re Sanchez, S049502 (DD). In this case, "the  
14 habeas petitioner's burden still must be met by showing there was no reasonable basis for the  
15 state court to deny relief," Richter, 562 U.S. at 98, and this Court "must determine what  
16 arguments or theories supported or . . . could have supported, the state court's decision; and then  
17 it must ask whether it is possible fair-minded jurists could disagree that those arguments or  
18 theories are inconsistent with the holding in a prior decision of this Court." Id. (emphasis  
19 added).

20 The Sixth Amendment provides that a criminal defendant shall have the right to "the  
21 Assistance of Counsel for his defense." As a general matter, a defendant alleging a Sixth  
22 Amendment violation must demonstrate "a reasonable probability that, but for counsel's  
23 unprofessional errors, the result of the proceeding would have been different." Strickland, 466  
24 U.S. at 694. An exception exists for cases in which counsel actively represents conflicting  
25 interests. Mickens, 535 U.S. at 166; Cuyler, 446 U.S. at 345-50. In such a case, prejudice is  
26 presumed. Id. However, Petitioner must establish that "an actual conflict of interest actually  
27 affected the adequacy of [defense counsel's] representation." Sullivan, 446 U.S. at 348-49.

1 Thus, “until a defendant shows that his counsel *actively represented* conflicting interests, he has  
2 not established the constitutional predicate for his claim of ineffective assistance.” Id., at 350  
3 (emphasis in original).

4 Petitioner cites to the facts in claims 23, 24 and 43 and alleges that lead defense counsel  
5 Toton’s disbarment publicity placed Toton in an actual conflict of interest of a personal and  
6 financial nature, preventing his effective assistance at penalty phase in ways not fully disclosed  
7 to Petitioner. The trial judge, according to Petitioner, did not adequately inquire into the matter  
8 and thereby allowed Toton to remain on the case. Petitioner alleges the trial judge never  
9 questioned Toton specifically about the debarment (Sealed RT July 26, 1988, at pp. 80-84),  
10 never obtained a copy of the debarment hearing decision, and agreed to Toton’s proposal to have  
11 co-defense counsel Frank talk to Petitioner about the debarment. (Id., at p. 82-84.) Petitioner  
12 asserts that Toton sought to avoid the issue of debarment. Toton refused to appear at the  
13 debarment hearing. (SHCP Ex. 517, p. 8.) He refused to comment to reporters about the issue.  
14 (SCHP Exhs. 703, 704.)

15 This Court finds it unlikely that Toton’s pending debarment influenced his actions as  
16 defense counsel, for reasons discussed by the state court. See Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 45-48,  
17 summarized as follows. Toton’s refusal to allow Petitioner to plead guilty lengthened rather than  
18 shortened the duration of this proceeding. Toton participated in arrangements for defense  
19 investigation and engaged in pre-trial preparation. (RT [5/16/88] 3-4.) He conducted pre-trial  
20 discovery (CT 649-663, 769), made preemptory challenges (CT 836-840) filed evidentiary  
21 motions (CT 841-45, 846-53, 854-58, RT 80, 97-113), conducted vigorous witness examination  
22 and cross-examination (CT 518-625; RT 2664-2670), and made a reasoned closing argument  
23 (RT 169-196). The evidentiary record simply does not suggest the pace, manner and method of  
24 Toton’s representation was influenced by the disciplinary proceedings. Toton was not disbarred  
25 until eight months after the court and defendant learned of the proceedings against him, and  
26 several month after completion of the penalty phase of defendant’s trial. Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at  
27 45-48.

1       Even if there were a conflict, Petitioner was aware of the possible problems with Toton's  
2 continued representation and his right to conflict free representation, having discussed these  
3 matters with co-counsel Frank for approximately an hour and he expressly waived any such  
4 conflict. Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 46; RT [7/27/88] 4-10. Based thereon, the state supreme court  
5 could reasonably have found that Petitioner validly waived any such conflict on the record and  
6 decided to keep Toton as counsel. See Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 37-39, 45-46.

7       Petitioner alleges that it was likely that one or more jurors was aware of Toton's adverse  
8 publicity and, given Toton's failure to withdraw, was prejudiced by it. However, he offers no  
9 evidentiary predicate supporting the allegation. The evidence does not suggest the trial court's  
10 failure to question juror's about Toton's debarment rendered trial "fundamentally unfair." (See  
11 RT 591-609 (juror Jones), RT 647-669 (juror Mooney), RT 1168-1183 (juror Roberts), RT 1338-  
12 1355 (juror Crowder), RT 1813-1831 (juror Razo), RT 1879-1892 (juror Stell), RT 2117-2136  
13 (juror G. Clark), RT 2137-2155 (juror P. Clark), RT 2401-2412 (juror O'Toole), RT 2435-2448  
14 (juror Raymond), RT 2454-2472 (juror Rodriguez), RT 2554-2566 (juror Zamora)). For reasons  
15 more fully discussed in claims 49 *ante*, and 55, *post*, this Court agrees with the California  
16 Supreme Court's determination that there was "no showing the jury was unfair or biased."  
17 Sanchez, 12 Cal. 4th at 62, n.6. As noted by that court, during voir dire only two of the jurors  
18 selected, Razo and Rodriguez, had heard of the case. (RT 1814-1815; 2458-2460, 2471.)  
19 Neither of those two jurors mentioned having hearing of Toton. Both of those jurors indicated  
20 they could put what they had heard out of mind while deliberating. *Id.* Petitioner proffers no  
21 evidence these statements were somehow untrue. The state court could have reasonably  
22 determined that none of the jurors selected were exposed to media coverage of Toton's  
23 disciplinary matters. Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 61; claim 55, *post*. Moreover, the state court could  
24 reasonably find that questioning jurors about the publicity was likely to be more prejudicial than  
25 that publicity itself. (SHCP Ex. 137, ¶ 29.)

26       Petitioner has not established that defense counsel's performance at the penalty phase fell  
27 below an objective standard of reasonableness and that, but for counsel's unprofessional errors,  
28

1 the result of the proceeding would have been different. Strickland, 466 U.S., at 687-694. It was  
2 not objectively unreasonable for the state court to find there was no reasonable probability any  
3 juror was aware of the debarment proceeding and influenced by it. See Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 61.

4 Accordingly, the Court finds that a fair-minded jurist could have found that Petitioner  
5 failed to establish that the state court rejection of the claim was contrary to, or an unreasonable  
6 application of, clearly established federal law, or an or an unreasonable determination of the facts  
7 in light of the evidence presented in the state court proceeding, viewed most favoring the  
8 prosecution. Jackson, 443 U.S. at 319. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

9 Claim 53 is denied.

10 **m. Review of Claim 54**

11 In his next claim, Petitioner alleges that juror George Razo was not an impartial juror.

12 The California Supreme Court summarily denied claim 54 (SPet. Claim KK) raised in  
13 Petitioner's state petition for habeas corpus. In re Sanchez, S049502 (DD). In this case, "the  
14 habeas petitioner's burden still must be met by showing there was no reasonable basis for the  
15 state court to deny relief," Richter, 562 U.S. at 98, and this Court "must determine what  
16 arguments or theories supported or . . . could have supported, the state court's decision; and then  
17 it must ask whether it is possible fair-minded jurists could disagree that those arguments or  
18 theories are inconsistent with the holding in a prior decision of this Court." Id. (emphasis  
19 added).

20 "[T]he right to jury trial guarantees to the criminally accused a fair trial by a panel of  
21 impartial, 'indifferent' jurors." Irvin, 366 U.S. at 722; see also Skilling, 561 U.S. at 377-78.  
22 "[P]art of the guarantee of a defendant's right to an impartial jury is an adequate voir dire to  
23 identify unqualified jurors." Morgan v. Illinois, 504 U.S. 719, 729 (1992). "Voir dire 'is  
24 conducted under the supervision of the court, and a great deal must, of necessity, be left to its  
25 sound discretion.'" Ristaino v. Ross, 424 U.S. 589, 594 (1976) (quoting Connors v. United  
26 States, 158 U.S. 408, 413 (1895)). "[T]he trial court retains great latitude in deciding what  
27 questions should be asked on voir dire." Mu'Min, 500 U.S. at 424. No hard-and-fast formula

1 dictates the necessary depth or breadth of voir dire, see United States v. Wood, 299 U.S. 123,  
2 145–146 (1936), and “[t]he Constitution . . . does not dictate a catechism for voir dire, but only  
3 that the defendant be afforded an impartial jury.” Morgan, 504 U.S. at 729. A trial court’s failure  
4 to ask certain questions does not violate the Constitution unless it “render[s] the defendant’s trial  
5 fundamentally unfair.” Mu’Min, 500 U.S. at 426.

6 Petitioner contends that, during voir dire, Razo admitted his exposure to a news article  
7 about this case and stated that the murder of his cousin four years earlier would not affect his  
8 deliberations (RT 1815, 1822), but after the trial, Razo stated to a defense investigator that his  
9 cousin’s murder may have had some impact on him in Petitioner’s case. (SPet. Exhs. 124, App.  
10 B, ¶ 5; 124, ¶ 13.)

11 The record before the state court shows that juror Razo stated during voir dire that he  
12 recalled reading an article in the Bakersfield Californian that included Petitioner’s picture and  
13 stated his involvement in a number of alleged criminal activities. (RT 1814-1816.) Razo stated  
14 that the article and the murder of his cousin four years earlier would not affect his deliberations.  
15 (RT 1821-1822.) The evidence in the record suggests it unlikely that Razo’s deliberation was  
16 affected by the article. (See claim 49, *ante*.) Nor are Razo’s post-trial hearsay and unsigned  
17 statements competent evidence that he was other than truthful during voir dire concerning his  
18 cousin’s murder. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 802; Fed. R. Evid. 606(b); Cal. Evid. Code § 1150.

19 In addition, Petitioner has not demonstrated prejudice, i.e., that the error had a  
20 “substantial and injurious effect or influence in determining the jury’s verdict.” Brecht, 507 U.S.  
21 at 638. For the reasons just discussed, the state court could reasonably have concluded that  
22 Razo’s deliberations were unaffected by the article.

23 Accordingly, it was not objectively unreasonable for the State Supreme Court to find  
24 there was no reasonable probability juror Razo was other than an impartial juror. 28 U.S.C. §  
25 1746; Ortiz v. INS, 179 F.3d 1148, 1153-54 (9th Cir. 1994) (no ineffective assistance where no  
26 demonstration of prejudice).

27 The state court could reasonably have concluded that Petitioner failed to establish that the  
28

1 performance of defense counsel at the penalty phase fell below an objective standard of  
2 reasonableness and that, but for counsel's unprofessional errors, the result of the proceeding  
3 would have been different. Strickland, 466 U.S., at 687-694.

4 The Court finds that a fair-minded jurist could have found that Petitioner failed to  
5 establish that the state court rejection of the claim was contrary to, or an unreasonable  
6 application of, clearly established federal law, or an unreasonable determination of the facts in  
7 light of the evidence presented in the state court proceeding, viewed most favoring the  
8 prosecution. Jackson, 443 U.S. at 319. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

9 Claim 54 is denied.

10 **n. Review of Claim 55<sup>9</sup>**

11 In this claim, Petitioner alleges court error by failure to voir dire the jury regarding  
12 publicity about defense counsel's pending disbarment.

13 The California Supreme Court considered this claim on appeal and found that the defense  
14 had not objected on this ground or sought a curative admonition at trial and thus waived the issue  
15 on appeal. Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th 61-62. That court also found that there was "no showing the jury  
16 was unfair or biased", Sanchez, 12 Cal. 4th at 62, n.6, and that "the trial court's voir dire  
17 adequately insured an impartial jury, without unnecessarily exposing the jury to the very  
18 information defendant found could prejudice his case." Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 62.

19 "[T]he right to jury trial guarantees to the criminally accused a fair trial by a panel of  
20 impartial, 'indifferent' jurors." Irvin, 366 U.S. at 722; see also Skilling, 561 U.S. at 377-78.  
21 "[T]he trial court retains great latitude in deciding what questions should be asked on voir dire."  
22 Mu'Min, 500 U.S. at 424. A trial court's failure to ask certain questions does not violate the  
23 Constitution unless it "render[s] the defendant's trial fundamentally unfair." Mu'Min, 500 U.S.  
24 at 426.

25 Two specific inquires of voir dire are constitutionally compelled: inquiries into racial  
26 prejudice against a defendant charged with a violent crime against a person of a different racial  
27

---

28 <sup>9</sup> The legal basis of the Eighth Amendment was stricken as unexhausted. ECF No. 60 at 9:5.

1 group, *id.*, at 424; and, in a capital case, inquiries into a juror's views on capital punishment.  
2 Morgan, 504 U.S. at 730-732. Petitioner does not raise such a basis for compelled inquiry in  
3 this claim. Instead he claims that the voir dire questionnaire, the trial court, and defense counsel  
4 all failed to inquire whether prospective jurors had heard anything about the attorneys in this  
5 case.

6 The Court is unpersuaded by this claim for reasons discussed in claim 49, *ante*. During  
7 voir dire, the following eight jurors indicated they had never heard of the case, did not know  
8 counsel, and did not subscribe to and did not usually read the Bakersfield Californian: juror  
9 Jones (CT 258; RT 594, 596-597, 606); juror Mooney (CT 256, RT 647, 664); juror Roberts  
10 (CT 237, RT 1170); juror Stell (CT 184, RT 1882); juror G. Clark (CT 229, RT 2120); juror P.  
11 Clark (CT 228; RT 2140-2141); juror O'Toole (CT 220, RT 2401-2402, 2406); and juror  
12 Raymond (CT 217, RT 2438-2439). Two jurors, juror Crowder (CT 207; RT 1342-1343) and  
13 juror Zamora (CT 213; RT 2554, 2563) regularly read the Bakersfield Californian but were  
14 unaware of the case and did not know counsel.

15 Only two of the jurors selected, Razo and Rodriguez, stated they had heard of the case.  
16 (RT 1814-1815; 2458-2460, 2471-2472.) Neither mentioned having hearing of Toton; both  
17 indicated they did not believe everything they read in newspapers and could put what they had  
18 heard out of mind while deliberating. *Id.* Petitioner proffers no evidence these juror statements  
19 were untrue. The state court could reasonably have found that prospective jurors were properly  
20 voir dired regarding any pretrial publicity without exposing them to the allegedly prejudicial  
21 information.

22 Based on the record, the state court could reasonably have found that specific voir dire  
23 regarding Toton's disbarment proceeding was unnecessary and could serve to education the  
24 jurors on the potentially prejudicial information. See Mu'Mun, 500 U.S. at 425-428 (1991) (trial  
25 court's failure to ask questions must "render the defendant's trial fundamentally unfair" and may  
26 be overturned only for "manifest error.").

27 Nor has Petitioner pointed to evidence that demonstrates prejudice, i.e., that the error had  
28

1 a “substantial and injurious effect or influence in determining the jury’s verdict.” Brecht, 507  
2 U.S. at 638 (1991). For the reasons just discussed, the state court could reasonably have  
3 concluded that, despite the limited voir dire regarding Toton’s pretrial publicity, Petitioner  
4 received a fair trial.

5 Accordingly, the state court could reasonably have concluded that Petitioner failed to  
6 establish that defense counsel’s performance fell below an objective standard of reasonableness  
7 and that, but for counsel’s unprofessional errors, the result of the proceeding would have been  
8 different. Strickland, 466 U.S., at 687-694.

9 The state court rejection of the claim was not contrary to, or an unreasonable application  
10 of, clearly established federal law, or an unreasonable determination of the facts in light of the  
11 evidence presented in the state court proceeding, viewed most favoring the prosecution. Jackson,  
12 443 U.S. at 319. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

13 Claim 55 denied.

14 **o. Review of Claim 56**

15 In his next claim, Petitioner alleges prejudicial and misleading victim photos were  
16 erroneously admitted at trial. He complains of autopsy photographs, excluded at the guilt phase,  
17 and admitted over defense objection at the penalty phase, and of crime scene victim photographs  
18 not objected to by the defense that were admitted during the penalty phase. According to  
19 Petitioner, these photos were cumulative of other testimony and misleading as to Petitioner’s  
20 culpability in the homicides as they showed injuries not inflicted by Petitioner. He claims the  
21 photographs had an impact on jurors.

22 The California Supreme Court summarily denied claim 56 (SPet. Claim NN) raised in  
23 Petitioner’s state petition for habeas corpus. In re Sanchez, S049502 (DD).

24 Additionally, the state supreme court found on direct appeal that admission of autopsy  
25 photographs was not prejudicial error:

26 We have examined [the autopsy photographs] and have determined “they are not so  
27 horrific or shocking that we can conclude the trial court abused its discretion in  
28 admitting them.” [Citation] The jury was familiar with the facts of the crime, and  
the photographs had substantial probative value in demonstrating defendant’s

1 culpability as an aider and abettor, and as corroborative of Hernandez's testimony  
2 implicating defendant in the crimes. Moreover, the probative value of the  
3 photographs was not diminished simply because the scalp wounds alone were not  
4 fatal to the victims. The photographs corroborated the testimonial evidence and  
5 were "relevant to a determination of the appropriateness of the death penalty."  
6 [Citation]

7 Defendant's claim that there was no dispute as to the circumstances of the murders  
8 is not supported by the facts. Defense counsel Frank argued at the penalty phase  
9 that defendant should be spared the death penalty if the jury had a "lingering doubt"  
about the extent of defendant's participation in the Bocanegra killings.

10 . . . [T]he autopsy photographs depicting the Bocanegras' scalp wounds were  
11 clearly probative of (i) the manner in which the victims were wounded, (ii)  
12 defendant's culpability as an aider and abettor, (iii) the malice and aggravation of  
13 the crime, and (iv) the appropriate ultimate penalty. [Citation] . . . [T]he court did  
14 not err in admitting the autopsy photographs at the penalty phase.

15 Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th 64-65.

16 A due process claim can be stated where graphic photos of victims make the trial  
17 fundamentally unfair. Jammal, 926 F.2d at 919. However, photos that are relevant to the crime  
18 charges and elements thereof are admissible. See Villafuerte, 75 F.3d at 1343. Under California  
19 law, "photographs which disclose the manner in which the victim was wounded are relevant on  
20 the issues of malice and aggravation of the crime and the penalty." Thompson, 50 Cal.3d at 182.

21 The Court finds that, based on the evidentiary record, and for the same reasons discussed  
22 in claim 45, the state court could reasonably have found that the two autopsy photos of Mr.  
23 Bocanegra and Mrs. Bocanegra's scalp wounds (People's Exhs. 13, 14), and the victim and  
24 crime scene photos (People's Exhs. 5-9, 15-43 and 55-66) served to corroborate testimony as to  
25 circumstances of the murders, defense counsel arguments of diminished culpability (see RT  
26 3051-3055), and were relevant and probative as aggravation evidence and going to penalty  
selection. Autopsy photographs of scalp wounds to Mr. Bocanegra and Mrs. Bocanegra were  
properly admitted as relevant to expert testimony and issues of aggravation and penalty and were  
not unnecessarily gruesome. The crime scene and autopsy photographs could reasonably be seen  
by the state court as relevant to circumstances of the murders, identities of murders and murders'  
states of mind.

27 It appears unlikely that Petitioner was subjected to prejudice from defense counsel's  
28

1 failure to object to the introduction of crime scene photographs depicting the wounds of the  
2 Bocanegras and Mr. Tatman. The trial court did not find the photographs prejudicial as  
3 depicting a “blood and guts type of thing. . . .” (RT 2881-2882.) The California Supreme Court  
4 could reasonably have found the photographs relevant and probative of charges and elements  
5 including intent to kill, aggravation and penalty, such that defense counsel’s failure to object did  
6 not necessarily demonstrate ineffective assistance. See Nefstad, 66 F.3d 335, at \*3 (holding no  
7 violation of due process where prosecutor during closing argument shows photographs of victim  
8 before and after murder because relevant to intent).

9       Admission of the photographs did not render trial “fundamentally unfair.” Batchelor v.  
10 Cupp, 693 F.2d 859, 865 (9th Cir. 1982) (admission of photographs lies largely within the  
11 discretion of the trial court, whose ruling will not be disturbed . . . unless the admission of the  
12 photographs rendered the trial fundamentally unfair). Defense counsel Frank argued his  
13 lingering doubt theory, (RT 3048-3072), that Petitioner did not intend to kill or assist in killing  
14 Mr. Tatman (id.,), and that Petitioner had no criminal intent when he went to the Bocanegra  
15 residence (id.).

16       Additionally, even without the photographs, it is not reasonably probable the jury would  
17 have returned a sentence less than death. The evidence in aggravation including the  
18 circumstances surrounding the murders of the Bocanegras and Mr. Tatman, and Petitioner’s 1982  
19 assaults on Ammarie and Pena, was not insubstantial. (RT 2863-2874.)

20       Accordingly, the state court could have found that Petitioner failed to establish that  
21 defense counsel’s performance at penalty phase fell below an objective standard of  
22 reasonableness and that, but for counsel’s unprofessional errors, the result of the proceeding  
23 would have been different. Strickland, 466 U.S., at 687-694.

24       This Court does not find that the state court rejection of the claim was contrary to, or an  
25 unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law, as determined by the Supreme  
26 Court, or that the state court’s ruling was based on an unreasonable determination of the facts in  
27 light of the evidence presented in the state court proceeding, viewed most favoring the  
28

1 prosecution, Jackson, 443 U.S. at 319. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

2 Claim 56 is denied.

3 **p. Review of Claim 57**

4 Petitioner next claims that the trial court erred by inadequately and erroneously  
5 explaining the guilt verdicts and by improperly restricting defense counsel's closing argument  
6 regarding the guilt verdicts.

7 The California Supreme Court summarily denied this claim (SPet. Claim II) raised in  
8 Petitioner's state petition for habeas corpus. In re Sanchez, S049502 (DD).

9 The state supreme court also considered and rejected this claim on direct appeal. That  
10 court found that Petitioner failed to meet the state procedural requirement of timely objection and  
11 thus waived the issue on appeal and was procedurally barred on collateral review, noting that:

12 [C]ounsel did not object to the court's incorrect reading of the multiple-murder  
13 special-circumstances verdict. Hence, if any error occurred, it was waived.  
14 [Citation] Moreover, even if counsel had objected, we would find any error the  
15 court made in reading incorrectly the multiple-murder special-circumstance  
findings, or any confusion caused by the court's verdict as to the Batman charges,  
could have been rendered harmless by an admonition to the jury.

16 Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 75.

17 The state supreme court went on to consider the trial court's verdict misstatement and  
18 defense attorney Frank's argument to the jury clarifying and arguing the Batman verdict, as  
19 follows:

20 Prior to penalty phase arguments, at defense counsel Frank's request, the trial  
21 court read the information and summarized the guilt verdict, including the special  
22 circumstances findings, for the jury. In summarizing the verdict, the court  
23 purported to read from the August 3, 1988, minute order which . . . found true the  
multiple-murder special circumstance with respect to the Bocanegra murders only  
and did not include the Batman murder in the special-circumstance disposition.  
24 Purporting to read from the August 3 minute order, the court inexplicably  
included Batman as part of the [special circumstance] finding when it summarized  
the verdict to the jury. That finding is not in the record copy of the minute order.

25 Also during penalty phase argument, Frank explained to the jury the meaning of  
26 the felony-murder charges in the Batman verdict, and discussed defendant's role as  
27 an accomplice in the Batman robbery and murder in an apparent attempt to clarify  
the court's allegedly inconsistent verdicts finding defendant guilty of the first  
degree murder and robbery of Batman, but finding not true the robbery-murder  
special circumstance. Frank's explanation of the felony-murder verdict was

1 interrupted by Ryals's successful objection. Defendant now complains that the  
2 court's erroneous inclusion of the Batman murder as part of the multiple-murder  
3 special-circumstance finding in the Bocanegra murders, and its failure to explain  
4 (or allow counsel to adequately explain) its allegedly inconsistent verdict and  
5 special-circumstance finding in the Batman murder verdicts amounted to "the use  
6 of false or misleading evidence in capital sentencing" in violation of defendant's  
7 Fourteenth Amendment right to due process, and the Eighth Amendment right to a  
8 fair trial. [Citation]

9  
10 In addition, Frank's penalty phase argument explained to the jury the meaning of  
11 the Batman verdict: "The significance of what [defendant] was and wasn't  
12 convicted of, I would submit to you, establishes a lot of facts, number one, that he  
13 himself did not kill Woodrow [Wilson] Batman. You heard the evidence. I think  
14 you can infer from the evidence, from the verdicts that it was not Ted Sanchez  
15 who killed Mr. Batman, it was Robert Reyes. I submit to you that you can  
16 logically infer from what you've heard that Ted Sanchez did not kill Mr. Batman  
17 nor did he share in Robert Reyes' intent to kill Mr. Batman. Ted's role in that  
18 tragic incident was limited to removing some of Mr. Batman's property. You  
19 heard the evidence. Mr. Batman was not supposed to even have known that his  
20 property had been taken . . . ."

21 ; Frank next repeated to the jury: "Robert Reyes took it upon himself to kill, but  
22 Ted had no part in that." Frank then explained the multiple-murder special-  
23 circumstance findings and argued the circumstances of the Bocanegra murders as  
24 a mitigating factor. . . .

25 "Now let's turn to the charges involving the Bocanegras. Teddy was charged in  
26 count two of the Information with having killed Mr. Bocanegra and in count three  
27 of the Information with having killed Mrs. Bocanegra. Each count carried with it  
28 the special circumstance that the murder had been committed during the course of  
a robbery. Although he was found guilty of the murders of Mr. and Mrs.  
Bocanegra, the special circumstance that the murders occurred during the course  
of a robbery were not found true. In addition, he was found not guilty of robbing  
the Bocanegras as was alleged in count five.

29 "I submit to you that the importance of all this is that you can infer that when Ted-  
30 that when Ted went over to the Bocanegra house he did not do so with the intent  
31 to rob him. In fact, I would submit that you can infer that when he went over to  
32 that house he didn't intend to commit any criminal acts against the Bocanegras,  
33 and that it wasn't until after Joey and his father started fighting that Teddy thought  
34 about engaging in any criminal activity.

35 "Now, I bring all this to your attention because the law says that you can take into  
36 account the circumstances of the crimes when you deliberate on the issue of  
37 penalty . . . .

38 "Now this factor is general, looked upon as being an aggravating factor, one that  
39 doesn't usually contain any mitigating value, but I submit to you that, in this case,  
40 if you look closely at the facts and circumstances of what transpired at the Batman  
41 and Bocanegra residence[s], you will find significant mitigating values there."

42 Frank thereafter told the jury that it was Reyes, not defendant, who killed Batman,  
43 and that defendant "had no criminal intent when he went over to [the Bocanegras']  
44 house." He also argued that these same facts could be interpreted as mitigating  
45 evidence . . . . Frank's argument likely clarified for the jury any misperceptions  
46 about the verdict that occurred in light of the court's statement of the verdict.

Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 74-76. The state court, upon considering the foregoing found the misstatement to be alternatively procedurally barred and harmless:

We conclude any error the court made in the court's verdict statement was harmless. Defendant requested the court read the verdict and special circumstance findings, and failed to correct the court or offer clarifying instructions in order to remedy any misperceptions the jury may have had about the verdict. Moreover, counsel's explanation of the verdict to the jury during argument more than clarified any potential confusion the jury may have experienced following the court's explanation. The prosecutor did not mention the erroneous verdict, or capitalize on its inclusion. Defendant was convicted of three counts of first degree murder, including one supportable special-circumstance allegation, as well as two counts of use of a deadly weapon, and one count of robbery. Under these circumstances, there is no reasonable possibility that consideration of the court's potentially confusing reading of the guilt phase verdict could have improperly influenced the jury. [Citation]

Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 76.

Petitioner contends that the trial court misled the jury, telling them Petitioner was guilty of Mr. Tatman's first degree murder, and guilty of robbery of Mr. Tatman, but not guilty of the robbery special circumstance under California Penal Code section 190.2(a)(17). In Petitioner's view, the jury was unaware the verdict implicitly found that Petitioner was not Mr. Tatman's actual killer and that Petitioner was found not to have intended the killing of Mr. Tatman.

The Court finds, however, that the state supreme could reasonably have determined that the trial court reading of the guilt verdicts was adequately clarified by defense counsel's penalty phase argument. Defense attorney Frank pointed out to the jury where the evidentiary record supported inference from the verdicts that Petitioner did not intend to kill Mr. Tatman and did not kill him. Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 74-77. Frank's argument was sufficient to make harmless any error by the trial court in explaining the verdicts.

Petitioner contends the trial court errantly explained the verdict regarding the “multiple murder” special circumstance, stating such was predicated on the murders of Mr. Tatman and Mr. Bocanegra when in fact it was predicated on the murders of Mr. & Mrs. Bocanegra. Petitioner claims this misled the jury into believing the Tatman murder was a capital crime and as such was an aggravating factor. Here as well, the state supreme court could reasonably have

1 found defense counsel Frank's argument and the court's admonitions and instructions to be  
2 sufficiently clarifying of misstatement by the trial court. Frank argued at penalty phase that,  
3 based on the evidence, Petitioner had no criminal intent when he arrived at the Bocanegra home,  
4 and explained to the jury the meaning of the felony-murder charges in the Batman verdict, and  
5 discussed defendant's role as an accomplice in the Batman murder and robbery. *Id.*; RT 3052-  
6 3072. These defense arguments sufficiently clarified the trial court's allegedly inconsistent  
7 verdicts finding defendant guilty of the first degree murder and robbery of Mr. Batman but  
8 finding not true the robbery-murder special circumstance.

9 Petitioner contends that the trial court improperly restricted Frank's closing argument  
10 regarding the Batman conviction and felony murder rule, on grounds the rule was not part of the  
11 evidence. Petitioner maintains this was error in that the prosecution had argued to the jury that  
12 Petitioner killed Mr. Batman, treating the first degree felony-murder conviction as a capital  
13 crime. However, as Respondent correctly notes, the felony murder rule was not in evidence or  
14 part of the jury instructions. Defense counsel Frank was not restricted in arguing the  
15 circumstances surrounding the Batman murder and verdict. Petitioner was able to argue the  
16 inference that he did not intend to kill Mr. Batman and did not kill him. Defense counsel Frank's  
17 closing argument stated and clarified the specific charges levied and those upon which Petitioner  
18 was convicted and argued for mitigation based on the facts and circumstances in the evidentiary  
19 record. (RT 3050-3072.)

20 The state record does not reasonably suggest the likelihood that the trial court verdict  
21 statement improperly influenced the jury. Any error in the trial court's statement of the verdicts,  
22 that the multiple murder circumstance was based on the murders of Mr. Batman and Mr.  
23 Bocanegra, was harmless because, based on Frank's penalty phase and closing arguments (RT  
24 3050-3072) and the instructions given (RT 2611-2616, 3082-3097; CT 979-1021), there is no  
25 reasonable probability the jury mistakenly believed Batman was a capital crime.

26 Accordingly, Petitioner has not established that defense counsel's performance at penalty  
27 phase fell below an objective standard of reasonableness and that, but for counsel's  
28

1 unprofessional errors, the result of the proceeding would have been different. Strickland, 466  
2 U.S., at 687-694.

3 This Court does not find that the state court rejection of the claim was contrary to, or an  
4 unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law, as determined by the Supreme  
5 Court, or that the state court's ruling was based on an unreasonable determination of the facts in  
6 light of the evidence presented in the state court proceeding, viewed most favoring the  
7 prosecution, Jackson, 443 U.S. at 319. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

8 Claim 57 is denied.

9 **q. Review of Claim 58<sup>10</sup>**

10 In his next claim, which includes multiple subclaims, Petitioner alleges inadequate and  
11 unconstitutional jury instructions at the penalty phase. The subclaims are reviewed separately.

12 *i. Lingering Doubt*

13 Petitioner alleges that the trial court rejected his “lingering doubt” instruction even  
14 though California law mandates mitigating consideration of lingering doubt and defense counsel  
15 argued discrepancies in Hernandez’s testimony created lingering doubt as to Petitioner’s guilt.

16 The state supreme court reached and rejected this subclaim on direct appeal, finding that  
17 the trial court did not err in rejecting Petitioner’s specific instruction on lingering doubt:

18 Defendant's proposed instruction asked the jury to “consider as a mitigating factor  
19 residual or lingering doubt as to Mr. Sanchez's guilt for the crimes of which he has  
20 been convicted.” Although defendant recognizes that the state and federal  
21 Constitutions do not require a residual doubt instruction, he asserts the instruction  
22 should have been given in this case because it was warranted by the evidence. He  
23 relies on section [California Penal Code §] 190.3, factor (f), which gives the judge  
24 discretion to instruct the jury “on any points of law pertinent to the issue,” and  
case law that holds section 190.3, factor (f) may require a court to give the  
“residual doubt” instruction should the evidence warrant it. [Citation] Claiming  
that the evidence was insufficient to find him guilty of the first degree murders of  
Mr. and Mrs. Bocanegra, defendant contends “residual doubt” was “a  
circumstance of the capital crimes that could be considered by the jury under both  
[section] 190.3, factors (a) and (k).”

25 We find no error. It is true, as defendant claims, that the jury's consideration of  
26 residual doubt is proper; defendant may assert his possible innocence to the jury  
27 as a factor in mitigation under section 190.3, factors (a) and (k). [Citation] But  
28

---

<sup>10</sup> The legal basis of the Fifth Amendment, and the legal basis of the Sixth Amendment except with regard to the lingering doubt instruction was stricken as unexhausted. ECF No. 60 at 9:6-8.

1 there is no requirement, under either state or federal law, that the court specifically  
2 instruct the jury to consider any residual doubt of defendant's guilt. [Citation]

3 Here, the trial court instructed the jury that it could consider “[t]he circumstances  
4 of the crime of which defendant was convicted in the present proceeding and the  
5 existence of any special circumstance found to be true” (§ 190.3, factor (a)), and  
6 “any other circumstance which extenuates the gravity of the crime, even though it  
7 is not a legal excuse for the crime, and any sympathetic or other aspect of the  
8 defendant's character or record that the defendant offers as a basis for a sentence  
9 less than death, whether or not related to the offense for which he is on trial” (Id.,  
10 factor (k)). These instructions on the scope of mitigating circumstances  
11 sufficiently encompassed the concept of residual doubt about defendant's guilt.  
12 [Citation]

13 In addition, as we have observed, defense counsel told the jury that the  
14 circumstances of the crimes could be viewed as mitigating evidence of defendant's  
15 intent to kill. He also emphasized to the jury that section 190.3, factor (k) allows it  
16 to “consider any aspect of the defendant's character or record that he offers as a  
17 basis for a sentence less than death,” and asked the jury whether it had “some  
18 lingering doubts about what [it] would have seen” if it had been inside the  
19 Bocanegra residence at the time of the murders. In light of the proper instructions  
20 given to the jury, and counsel's argument, we conclude the trial court did not err in  
21 rejecting defendant's specific instruction on lingering doubt. [Citation]

22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28 Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 77-83.

29 “[T]he Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments require that the sentencer, in all but the rarest  
30 kind of capital case, not be precluded from considering, as a mitigating factor, any aspect of a  
31 defendant's character or record and any of the circumstances of the offense that the defendant  
32 proffers as a basis for a sentence less than death.” Lockett, 438 U.S. 586 at 604; Eddings v.  
33 Oklahoma, 455 U.S. 104, 113-114 (1982) (adopting rule in Lockett). “The standard against  
34 which we assess whether jury instructions satisfy the rule of Lockett and Eddings was set forth in  
35 Boyde, 494 U.S. 370 (1990).” Johnson v. Texas, 509 U.S. 350, 367-68 (1993). In Boyde, the  
36 Supreme Court held that “there is no . . . constitutional requirement of unfettered sentencing  
37 discretion in the jury, and States are free to structure and shape consideration of mitigating  
38 evidence ‘in an effort to achieve a more rational and equitable administration of the death  
39 penalty.’” Boyde, 494 U.S. at 377 (quoting Franklin, 487 U.S. at 181 (plurality opinion)).

40 In evaluating the instructions, the “reviewing court must determine ‘whether there is a  
41 reasonable likelihood that the jury has applied the challenged instruction in a way that prevents  
42 the consideration of constitutionally relevant evidence.’” Johnson, 509 U.S. at 367 (quoting

1 Boyde, 494 U.S. at 380). “[W]e do not engage in a technical parsing of this language of the  
 2 instructions, but instead approach the instructions in the same way that the jury would—with a  
 3 ‘commonsense understanding of the instructions in the light of all that has taken place at the  
 4 trial.’” Id., at 368 (quoting Boyde, 494 U.S. at 381). Further, a single instruction “may not be  
 5 judged in artificial isolation,” but must be considered in light of the instructions as a whole and  
 6 the entire trial record.” Estelle v. McGuire, 502 U.S. 62, 72 (1991).

7       The failure to identify whether factors are aggravating or mitigating is plainly not  
 8 contrary to or an unreasonable application of Supreme Court authority. In Pulley v. Harris, the  
 9 Supreme Court reviewed California’s sentencing system, including the manner in which the jury  
 10 considered relevant factors in deciding the penalty. Pulley, 465 U.S. at 51. The Supreme Court  
 11 noted that the 1977 law (like the 1978 law applicable in this case) did not identify or separate the  
 12 aggravating or mitigating factors. Id. at 53 n.14. The Court found California’s death penalty law  
 13 to be constitutional. Id. at 51 (“Assuming that there could be a capital sentencing system so  
 14 lacking in other checks on arbitrariness that it would not pass constitutional muster without  
 15 comparative proportionality review, the 1977 California statute is not of that sort.”).

16       In Tuilaepa v. California, the Supreme Court again considered California’s death penalty  
 17 sentencing scheme. The Supreme Court rejected the argument that California’s “single list of  
 18 factors” was unconstitutional. The Court stated:

19       This argument, too, is foreclosed by our cases. A capital sentencer need not be  
 20 instructed how to weigh any particular fact in the capital sentencing decision. In  
California v. Ramos, for example, we upheld an instruction informing the jury  
 21 that the Governor had the power to commute life sentences and stated that “the  
 22 fact that the jury is given no specific guidance on how the commutation factor is  
 23 to figure into its determination presents no constitutional problem.” 463 U.S., at  
 24 1008–1009, n. 22, 103 S. Ct., at 3457–3458, n. 22. Likewise, in Proffitt v. Florida,  
 25 we upheld the Florida capital sentencing scheme even though “the various factors  
 26 to be considered by the sentencing authorities [did] not have numerical weights  
 27 assigned to them.” 428 U.S., at 258, 96 S. Ct., at 2969. In Gregg, moreover, we  
 28 “approved Georgia’s capital sentencing statute even though it clearly did not  
 channel the jury’s discretion by enunciating specific standards to guide the jury’s  
 consideration of aggravating and mitigating circumstances.” Zant, 462 U.S., at  
 875, 103 S. Ct., at 2742. We also rejected an objection “to the wide scope of  
 evidence and argument” allowed at sentencing hearings. 428 U.S., at 203–204, 96  
 S. Ct., at 2939. In sum, “discretion to evaluate and weigh the circumstances  
 relevant to the particular defendant and the crime he committed” is not  
 impermissible in the capital sentencing process. McCleskey v. Kemp, 481 U.S.

1 279, 315, n. 37, 107 S. Ct. 1756, 1779, n. 37, 95 L.Ed.2d 262 (1987). “Once the  
 2 jury finds that the defendant falls within the legislatively defined category of  
 3 persons eligible for the death penalty ... the jury then is free to consider a myriad  
 4 of factors to determine whether death is the appropriate punishment.” Ramos,  
 5 *supra*, 463 U.S., at 1008, 103 S. Ct., at 3457. Indeed, the sentencer may be given  
 6 “unbridled discretion in determining whether the death penalty should be imposed  
 7 after it has found that the defendant is a member of the class made eligible for that  
 8 penalty.” Zant, *supra*, 4[62] U.S., at 875, 103 S. Ct., at 2742; *see also* Barclay v. Florida, 463 U.S. 939, 948–951, 103 S. Ct. 3418, 3424–3425, 77 L.Ed.2d 1134 (1983) (plurality opinion). In contravention of those cases, petitioners’ argument  
 9 would force the States to adopt a kind of mandatory sentencing scheme requiring  
 10 a jury to sentence a defendant to death if it found, for example, a certain kind or  
 11 number of facts, or found more statutory aggravating factors than statutory  
 12 mitigating factors. The States are not required to conduct the capital sentencing  
 13 process in that fashion. *See Gregg*, *supra*, 428 U.S., at 199–200, n. 50, 96 S. Ct.,  
 at 2937–2938, n. 50.

10 Tuilaepa, 512 U.S. at 975. The Court finds that, based on the state record, the jury was  
 11 adequately instructed that it could consider the circumstances of the convictions in the present  
 12 proceeding including any special circumstance found to be true and any other mitigating  
 13 circumstances under § 190.3, factor (k), encompassing the concept of residual or lingering doubt  
 about Petitioner’s guilt.

14 There is no persuasive argument that the instruction given in this case in any way  
 15 foreclosed the jury from considering any relevant mitigating evidence. As noted by Respondent,  
 16 the Supreme Court has examined the language in California’s jury instruction on mitigation  
 17 multiple times, and upheld it against constitutional challenges every time. *See Ayers v. Belmontes*, 549 U.S. 7 (2006); Brown v. Payton, 544 U.S. 133, 141, 142 (2005); Boyd, 494 U.S. 370. Thus, the state court rejection of the claim was reasonable. Even if constitutional trial  
 18 error did occur, Petitioner is not entitled to relief because any such error did not have a  
 19 “substantial and injurious effect or influence in determining the jury’s verdict.” Brecht, 507 U.S.  
 20 at 638.

21 The trial court’s use of the standard penalty phase instruction, California Criminal Jury  
 22 Instruction, (CALJIC), No. 8.84.1 (1986 rev.), regarding California Penal Code § 190.3 factor  
 23 (k), is adequate to permit jurors to consider relevant mitigating evidence. Boyd, 494 U.S. 370  
 24 at 381–382; Lockett, 438 U.S. at 604. The Eighth Amendment does not require that a jury be  
 25 instructed on particular statutory mitigating factors. Buchanan v. Angelone, 522 U.S. 269, 275–  
 26 27

1 77 (1998).

2 Petitioner then failed to establish that defense counsel's performance at the penalty  
3 phase fell below an objective standard of reasonableness and that, but for counsel's  
4 unprofessional errors, the result of the proceeding would have been different. Strickland, 466  
5 U.S., at 687-694.

6 Respondent contends this subclaim is not cognizable because it creates and retroactively  
7 applies a "new rule" of constitutional law within Teague v. Lane, 489 U.S. 288. However, the  
8 Court finds the claim fails not because Petitioner seeks to apply a new rule of criminal procedure  
9 under Teague, but rather on grounds the claim lacks merit for the reasons stated.

10 The Court finds the state court rejection of the subclaim was not contrary to, or an  
11 unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law, or an unreasonable determination of  
12 the facts in light of the evidence presented in the state court proceeding, viewed most favoring  
13 the prosecution. Jackson, 443 U.S. at 319. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

14 This subclaim is denied.

15 *ii. California Penal Code § 190.3 Sentencing Factors*

16 Petitioner next alleges that the trial court's use of CALJIC No. 8.84.1 (1986 rev.), which  
17 includes (Cal. Pen. Code § 190.3) sentencing factors "a" (consideration of current offense), "b"  
18 (consideration of violent criminal activity), and "c" (consideration of prior felony conviction),  
19 erroneously allowed the jury to inflate the aggravating weight of Petitioner's guilt phase crimes.  
20 Petitioner contends the jury improperly applied sentencing factors regarding presence of "violent  
21 criminal activity" and "prior felony convictions" to the charged offenses and to Petitioner's 1982  
22 assaults on store owner Hassan Ammarie and friend Arturo Pena.

23 The state supreme court reviewed this subclaim on direct appeal and rejected it, providing  
24 that:

25 [California Penal Code] Section 190.3 requires the jury to consider the  
26 circumstances of the offense (§ 190.3, factor (a)), the presence of violent criminal  
27 activity, (id., factor (b)), and prior felony convictions (id., factor (c)). The jury  
28 was instructed in the statutory language. [Citation] Defendant now claims the  
court erred by failing to clarify the differences between the above factors, thus

1 allowing the jury to give multiple consideration to the aggravating evidence under  
2 all these factors. He also asserts that the instructions erroneously permitted the  
3 jury to consider defendant's prior assaults under both factors (b) and (c), and  
4 improperly inflated the weight the jury should have given to either prior crime.

5 We have noted that section 190.3, factor (b), concerns crimes other than those for  
6 which defendant is being prosecuted [Citation], and we have directed that courts  
7 should give clarifying instructions "to avoid any confusion" that may be caused  
8 by the above factors. [Citation.] But we have consistently found that the absence  
9 of clarifying instructions is harmless [Citation], and that the standard instructions  
10 do not "inherently encourage 'double-counting' under section 190.3." [Citation]  
11 Therefore, "even if one or more jurors mistakenly consider a particular criminal  
12 incident under the wrong factor, there is little risk that a reasonable jury will give  
13 a single incident duplicative consideration." [Citation] Moreover, both the  
14 prosecutor and defense counsel separately explained the proper use of the  
15 evidence under the separate factors. Thus, any potential confusion the jury may  
16 have faced in light of the instructions was adequately addressed by both counsel's  
17 arguments. Accordingly, given the arguments and the absence of any improperly  
18 admitted evidence, we find that the court's failure to clarify the scope of each  
19 factor did not affect the outcome of the trial.

20 Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 79.

21 The legal standard for review of penalty phase instructions is also set forth in the  
22 subclaim above, to wit, "whether there is a reasonable likelihood that the jury has applied the  
23 challenged instruction in a way that prevents the consideration of constitutionally relevant  
24 evidence." Boyde, 494 U.S. at 380.

25 Petitioner's allegations lack merit. It is plainly not contrary to Supreme Court precedent  
26 to instruct the jury with all sentencing factors. The Supreme Court stated in Gregg v. Georgia:

27 The petitioner objects, finally, to the wide scope of evidence and argument  
28 allowed at [penalty] hearings. We think that the Georgia court wisely has chosen  
not to impose unnecessary restrictions on the evidence that can be offered at such  
a hearing and to approve open and far-ranging argument. So long as the evidence  
introduced and the arguments made at the [penalty] hearing do not prejudice a  
defendant, it is preferable not to impose restrictions. We think it desirable for the  
jury to have as much information before it as possible when it makes the  
sentencing decision.

29 Gregg, 428 U.S. at 203-204 (citations omitted).

30 The Court finds there is no reasonable likelihood the jury misinterpreted the instruction  
31 by inflating aggravation from the guilt phase crimes. It is well established that a sentencing  
32 court need not identify which factors are aggravating and which are mitigating. Pulley, 465 U.S.  
33 at 51 and 53 n.14; Tuilaepa, 512 U.S. at 979-80.

1       The state court could reasonably have found that the prosecution guilt phase argument  
2 was relevant only under the first sentencing factor. In fact, defense counsel Frank argued as  
3 much to the jury, that the guilt phase crimes should be considered only with regard to the first  
4 sentencing factor, (RT 3066-3067), ameliorating any juror confusion as to the current offense  
5 factor “a”.

6       The Ninth Circuit has found the second factor, which refers to crimes for which the  
7 defendant has not been convicted, not to be unconstitutionally vague, Bonin v. Calderon, 59 F.3d  
8 815, 848 (9th Cir. 1995), and that the third factor on its face aggravates for prior felony  
9 convictions precluding any reasonable probability the jury aggravated for the charged offenses.  
10 Id. The penalty phase evidence was relevant only to the second and third factors. The jury then  
11 could properly have considered the 1982 assaults under both the second and third factors, and  
12 that the prosecution’s argument in this regard was not improper. People v. Melton, 44 Cal.3d  
13 713, 764 (1988) (no constitutional obstacle to separate consideration of properly distinct aspects  
14 of the penalty determination, even when those aspects happen to coexist in a single incident).

15       Additionally, any error was harmless given the substantial weight of evidence in  
16 aggravation. Clemons v. Mississippi, 494 U.S. 738, 753 (1990) (“what is important . . . is an  
17 individualized determination on the basis of the character of the individual and the circumstances  
18 of the crime.”).

19       Respondent contends this subclaim is not cognizable because it creates and retroactively  
20 applies a “new rule” of constitutional law within Teague v. Lane, 489 U.S. 288. However, the  
21 Court finds the claim fails not because Petitioner seeks to apply a new rule of criminal procedure  
22 under Teague, but rather on grounds the claim lacks merit for the reasons stated.

23       The Court finds that the state court rejection of the subclaim was not contrary to, or an  
24 unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law, or an unreasonable determination of  
25 the facts in light of the evidence presented in the state court proceeding, viewed most favoring  
26 the prosecution. Jackson, 443 U.S. at 319. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

27       This subclaim is denied.

28

1           iii.    *Instructing Which Sentencing Factors were Aggravating/Mitigating*

2           Petitioner next alleges that the trial court improperly rejected defense instructions  
3 addressing which sentencing factors were aggravating and which were mitigating, (CT 1078-83),  
4 allowing the jury to improperly consider the absence of a mitigating factor as itself an  
5 aggravating factor.

6           The state supreme court considered and rejected this subclaim on direct appeal:

7           Defendant claims the prosecutor improperly implied that the absence of mitigating  
8 evidence under [California Penal Code] section 190.3, factors (e) and (f) should  
9 be considered as aggravating evidence. [Citation] We find no error. The  
10 prosecutor simply told the jury that there “was no evidence” of factor (e), and also  
11 argued that she could not recall hearing any factor (f) evidence, but that if the jury  
12 heard it the evidence could be considered in mitigation. Moreover, the jury was  
13 specifically instructed, pursuant to defendant’s request, that the “absence of any  
14 particular factor in mitigation is not to be treated as any factor in aggravation.” It  
15 is presumed that the jury followed the court’s instruction. [Citation]

16           Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 77-83.

17           The legal standard for review of penalty phase instructions is also set forth in the  
18 subclaim above, to wit, “whether there is a reasonable likelihood that the jury has applied the  
19 challenged instruction in a way that prevents the consideration of constitutionally relevant  
20 evidence.” Boyde, 494 U.S. at 380.

21           The Court finds it clearly established that a sentencing court need not identify which  
22 factors are aggravating and which are mitigating. Pulley, 465 U.S. at 51 and 53 n.14; Tuilaepa,  
23 512 U.S. at 979-80. The failure to identify whether factors are aggravating or mitigating is not  
24 contrary to or an unreasonable application of Supreme Court authority. Pulley, 465 U.S. at 53  
n.14; Tuilaepa, 512 U.S. at 975-80. This is fatal to Petitioner’s subclaim, since he cannot show  
that the state court rejection of his claim was contrary to or an unreasonable application of  
Supreme Court precedent.

25           The Ninth Circuit arrived at the same conclusion in Williams v. Calderon: “The death  
26 penalty statute’s failure to label aggravating and mitigating factors is constitutional.” Williams v.  
27 Calderon, 52 F.3d 1465, 1484-1485 (9th Cir. 1995). The Ninth Circuit has found California’s

1 death penalty statute does not violate due process by failure to label factors as aggravating or  
2 mitigating. See Williams, 52 F.3d at 1148-1485.

3 Respondent contends this subclaim is not cognizable because it creates and retroactively  
4 applies a “new rule” of constitutional law within Teague v. Lane, 489 U.S. 288. However, the  
5 Court finds the claim fails not because Petitioner seeks to apply a new rule of criminal procedure  
6 under Teague, but rather on grounds the claim lacks merit for the reasons stated.

7 The Court finds that the state court rejection of the subclaim was not contrary to, or an  
8 unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law, or an unreasonable determination of  
9 the facts in light of the evidence presented in the state court proceeding, viewed most favoring  
10 the prosecution. Jackson, 443 U.S. at 319; see 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

11 This subclaim is denied.

12 iv. Deleting Inapplicable Mitigating Factors

13 Petitioner alleges in this subclaim that the trial court erred in rejecting instructions  
14 deleting mitigating factors (Cal. Pen. Code § 190.3 (e) and (f)) which were not claimed by  
15 Petitioner and thus not relevant this case, i.e., factors that “victims participated in, or consented  
16 to their own deaths” or that Petitioner’s actions were “morally justified.” (CT 1078-1079.)  
17 Petitioner alleges that the prosecution argued the absence of evidence supporting these claims  
18 and thereby implied an illusory aggravating factor.

19 The state supreme court considered this claim on direct appeal and rejected it, noting that:

20 Defendant contends the court erred when it rejected his request to delete  
21 inapplicable mitigating factors (e) (whether victim participated in crime) and (f)  
22 (moral justification for crime) of [California Penal Code] section 190.3 from its  
23 standard statutory instructions, and injected irrelevant considerations into the  
jury's penalty deliberations, depriving him of his right to a fair and reliable penalty  
determination under the Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments.

24 The jury, however, was properly instructed to consider all the factors “if  
25 applicable” and later told to “take into account and be guided by” the applicable  
26 factors. [Citation] As we have in previous cases, we assume the jury properly  
followed the instruction and concluded that mitigating factors not supported by  
evidence were simply not “applicable.” [Citation]

27 Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 79.

28

1       The Court finds this subclaim to be unavailing. As noted in discussion of the subclaims  
2 above, the jury was instructed with CALJIC No. 8.84.1. That instruction allowed the jury to  
3 “consider” each factor “if applicable”, (CT 994-995; RT 3087-3089), precluding any reasonable  
4 probability Petitioner’s rights were violated by a failure to delete sentencing factors (Cal. Pen.  
5 Code § 190.3 (e) and (f)).

6       The legal standard for review of penalty phase instructions is “whether there is a  
7 reasonable likelihood that the jury has applied the challenged instruction in a way that prevents  
8 the consideration of constitutionally relevant evidence.” Boyde, 494 U.S. at 380. In this  
9 instance, it was not contrary to Supreme Court precedent to instruct the jury with all sentencing  
10 factors where the instructions expressly indicated that the jury was to consider each factor only if  
11 applicable. The Supreme Court stated in Gregg v. Georgia:

12       The petitioner objects, finally, to the wide scope of evidence and argument  
13 allowed at [penalty] hearings. We think that the Georgia court wisely has chosen  
14 not to impose unnecessary restrictions on the evidence that can be offered at such  
15 a hearing and to approve open and far-ranging argument. So long as the evidence  
16 introduced and the arguments made at the [penalty] hearing do not prejudice a  
defendant, it is preferable not to impose restrictions. We think it desirable for the  
jury to have as much information before it as possible when it makes the  
sentencing decision.

17 Gregg, 428 U.S. at 203-04. In Williams v. Calderon, the Ninth Circuit stated:

18       Williams argues that it was error to read to the jury the entire list of factors the  
19 state considered relevant to the sentencing decision, even when some did not  
apply. To the contrary, the jury instructions expressly indicated that the jury was  
20 to consider each factor only “if applicable.” Moreover, “[i]t seems clear ... that the  
problem [of jury inexperience] will be alleviated if the jury is given guidance  
21 regarding the factors about the crime and the defendant that the State,  
representing organized society, deems particularly relevant to the sentencing  
22 decision.” Gregg v. Georgia, 428 U.S. 153, 192, 96 S. Ct. 2909, 2934, 49 L.Ed.2d  
23 859 (1976) (plurality opinion). The reading of the complete list gave the jury  
more guidance, not less. We find nothing in the Constitution prohibiting the very  
24 practice Gregg encouraged.

25 Williams, 52 F.3d 1465 at 1481.

26       Consistent with the foregoing, this Court finds that the state court could reasonably have  
27 found it unlikely that the jury applied the challenged instruction in a way that prevented  
28

1 consideration of constitutionally relevant evidence. There was no requirement that a trial court  
2 redact the instructions to include only those factors deemed applicable. Moreover, the  
3 instruction itself advises the jury to consider the factors "if applicable." In Bonin v. Calderon,  
4 the Ninth Circuit again rejected the argument posited by Petitioner. Bonin, 59 F.3d at 847-48.  
5 The Bonin court noted that "the cautionary words 'if applicable' warned the jury that not all of  
6 the factors would be relevant and that the absence of a factor made it inapplicable rather than an  
7 aggravating factor." Id.

8 Respondent contends this subclaim is not cognizable because it creates and retroactively  
9 applies a "new rule" of constitutional law within Teague v. Lane, 489 U.S. 288. However, the  
10 Court finds the claim fails not because Petitioner seeks to apply a new rule of criminal procedure  
11 under Teague, but rather on grounds the claim lacks merit for the reasons stated.

12 The Court finds that that the state court rejection of the subclaim was not contrary to, or  
13 an unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law, or an or an unreasonable  
14 determination of the facts in light of the evidence presented in the state court proceeding, viewed  
15 most favoring the prosecution. Jackson, 443 U.S. at 319. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

16 This subclaim is denied.

17 v. Limiting Aggravation

18 Petitioner next alleges that the trial court erred by failing to instruct the jury it could not  
19 consider aggravating factors not included in the instructions. He claims this potentially allowed  
20 unrestricted aggravation. (RT 3087-3089, 3095.)

21 The state supreme court considered and rejected this subclaim on direct appeal, finding  
22 that there was no violation of state law:

23 Defendant also asserts the trial court erred by failing to instruct the jury not to  
24 consider non-statutory aggravating evidence in determining penalty. We have  
25 repeatedly rejected this contention, and defendant has not persuaded us to  
reconsider our conclusion. [Citation] Nor was the trial court required to label  
various factors as exclusively aggravating or mitigating. [Citation]

27 Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 79-80.

1       The legal standard for review of penalty phase instructions is as set forth in the subclaim  
2 above, to wit, “whether there is a reasonable likelihood that the jury has applied the challenged  
3 instruction in a way that prevents the consideration of constitutionally relevant evidence.”  
4 Boyde, 494 U.S. at 380.

5       This Court agrees with the state court’s rejection of the subclaim. At bottom, “what is  
6 important at the selection stage is an individualized determination on the basis of the character of  
7 the individual and the circumstances of the crime.” Zant, 462 U.S. at 879. There is no  
8 constitutional prohibition against non-statutory aggravating factors. Harris v. Pulley, 692 F.2d  
9 1189, 1193-94 (1982), overruled on other grounds, 465 U.S. 37 (1984); Zant, 462 U.S. at 878-79.  
10 As noted, California’s death penalty scheme allows for a sufficiently individualized sentence  
11 determination. Tuilaepa, 512 U.S. at 975. The trial court’s failure to instruct the jury that it  
12 could not consider non-statutory aggravating factors is plainly not contrary to or an unreasonable  
13 application of Supreme Court authority. Pulley, 465 U.S. at 51, 53 n.14; Tuilaepa, 512 U.S. at  
14 975-80.

15       The California Supreme Court found the specific instructions given allowed a fully  
16 individualized evaluation of aggravating and mitigating evidence. Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 79-80,  
17 citing People v. Hawthorne, 4 Cal.4th 43 at 74-74. Petitioner’s citation to People v. Boyd, 38  
18 Cal.3d 762 (1985) is not authority otherwise. Nor is it “the province of a federal habeas court to  
19 re-examine state court determinations on state law questions.” Estelle, 502 U.S. at 67-68.  
20 Furthermore, as the Supreme Court stated in Gregg v. Georgia:

21  
22       The petitioner objects, finally, to the wide scope of evidence and argument  
23 allowed at [penalty] hearings. We think that the Georgia court wisely has chosen  
24 not to impose unnecessary restrictions on the evidence that can be offered at such  
25 a hearing and to approve open and far-ranging argument. So long as the evidence  
introduced and the arguments made at the [penalty] hearing do not prejudice a  
defendant, it is preferable not to impose restrictions. We think it desirable for the  
jury to have as much information before it as possible when it makes the  
sentencing decision.

26  
27 Gregg, 428 U.S. at 203-04.  
28

1        Respondent contends this subclaim is not cognizable because it creates and retroactively  
2 applies a “new rule” of constitutional law within Teague v. Lane, 489 U.S. 288. However, the  
3 Court finds the claim fails not because Petitioner seeks to apply a new rule of criminal procedure  
4 under Teague, but rather on grounds the claim lacks merit for the reasons stated.

5        The Court finds that the state court rejection of the subclaim was not contrary to, or an  
6 unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law, or an unreasonable determination of  
7 the facts in light of the evidence presented in the state court proceeding, viewed most favoring  
8 the prosecution. Jackson, 443 U.S. at 319; see 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

9        This subclaim is denied.

10        *vi.        Limiting Modifiers*

11        Petitioner alleges that the trial court erred in denying his requested special instruction that  
12 sought to delete the adjective “extreme” from the reference in [mitigation factor] (d) to being  
13 under the influence of mental or emotional disturbance, and the adjective “substantial” from the  
14 reference in [mitigation factor] (g) to being under the domination of another person. He claims  
15 this prevented presentation of his mitigation evidence. (CT 1078-1079.)

16        The state supreme court considered and rejected this claim on direct appeal, finding that:

17        Defendant contends the trial court violated the Eighth Amendment by refusing his  
18 requested deletion of the adjectives “extreme” and “substantial” in instructions  
19 given in the language of section 190.3, factors (d) (whether defendant was under  
20 the influence of extreme mental or emotional disturbance at time of offense), and  
21 (g) (whether defendant acted under extreme duress or substantial domination of  
22 another person). We have rejected this argument in numerous cases, and  
23 defendant has failed to persuade us that we should reconsider these decisions.  
24 (See Turner, supra, 8 Cal.4th at pp. 208-209, and cases cited [catchall provision of  
25 section 190.3, factor (k) referring to “any other circumstance which extenuates the  
26 gravity of the crime” allows consideration of non-extreme mental or emotional  
27 conditions when read in conjunction with instructions on factors (d) and (g)].)

28        Sanchez 12 Cal. 4th at 80.

29        The jury, however, was properly instructed to consider all the factors “if  
30 applicable” and later told to “take into account and be guided by” the applicable  
31 factors. [Citation] As we have in previous cases, we assume the jury properly  
32 followed the instruction and concluded that mitigating factors not supported by  
33 evidence were simply not “applicable.” [Citation]

1 Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 79.

2       The Constitution requires that the jury must “not be precluded from considering, as a  
3 mitigating factor, any aspect of a defendant's character or record and any of the circumstances of  
4 the offense that the defendant proffers as a basis for a sentence less than death.” Lockett, 438  
5 U.S. at 604. The test is “whether there is a reasonable likelihood that the jury has applied the  
6 challenged instruction in a way that prevents the consideration of constitutionally relevant  
7 evidence.” Boyde, 494 U.S. at 380. Further, a single instruction “may not be judged in artificial  
8 isolation,” but must be considered in light of the instructions as a whole and the entire trial  
9 record. Estelle, 502 U.S. at 72.

10       Here, the Court finds that the trial court's use of CALJIC No. 8.84.1 (1986 rev.),  
11 regarding California Penal Code § 190.3 factor (k), was adequate to permit jurors to consider  
12 relevant mitigating evidence. Boyde, 494 U.S. at 381-82 (1990). The state supreme court  
13 rejected this subclaim, finding sufficient the trial court's instruction that (Cal. Pen. Code §  
14 190.3(k)) includes:

15  
16       [A]ny other circumstance which extenuates the gravity of the crime, even though  
17 it is not a legal excuse for the crime, and any sympathetic or other aspect of the  
18 defendant's character or record that the defendant offers as a basis for a sentence  
19 less than death, whether or not related to the offense for which he is on trial.

20       The Ninth Circuit has rejected Petitioner's argument where, as here, the jury was advised  
21 it could consider any other mitigating matter. See Hendricks v. Vasquez, 974 F.2d 1099, 1109  
22 (9th Cir. 1992). Moreover, as noted by the California Supreme Court, factors (d) and (g) cannot  
23 be read in isolation. It is clear that factor (k) on its face allows the jury to consider non-extreme  
24 and non-substantial mental or emotional conditions when read in conjunction with instructions  
25 on factors (d) and (g). See Sanchez, 12 Cal. 4th at 80.

26       The Supreme Court has stated that factor (k) directed the jury to consider “any other  
27 circumstance that might excuse the crime. . . .” Boyde, 494 U.S. at 382. Nothing suggests the  
28 instruction in issue here precluded the jury from considering the mitigating evidence proffered

1 by Petitioner. See e.g., Id. at 378. The Supreme Court has found that “[t]he factor (k) instruction  
2 is consistent with the constitutional right to present mitigating evidence in capital sentencing  
3 proceedings.” Ayers, 549 U.S. at 24.

4 In addition, the Supreme Court has reviewed this instruction on several occasions. It has  
5 rejected claims that the instruction restricts the jury’s consideration of mitigating evidence in  
6 every instance. See, e.g., Ayers, 549 U.S. at 7; Brown, 544 U.S. at 133; Boyde, 494 U.S. 370.

7 Respondent contends this subclaim is not cognizable because it creates and retroactively  
8 applies a “new rule” of constitutional law within Teague v. Lane, 489 U.S. 288. However, the  
9 Court finds the claim fails not because Petitioner seeks to apply a new rule of criminal procedure  
10 under Teague, but rather on grounds the claim lacks merit for the reasons stated.

11 The Court finds that the state court rejection of the subclaim was not contrary to, or an  
12 unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law, or an unreasonable determination of  
13 the facts in light of the evidence presented in the state court proceeding, viewed most favoring  
14 the prosecution. Jackson, 443 U.S. at 319. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

15 This subclaim is denied.

16 vii. “Pinpoint” Mitigation Instructions

17 In this subclaim, Petitioner alleges that the trial court erred in denying his requested  
18 special “pinpoint” instructions relating to the defense theory of mitigating childhood and family  
19 facts and circumstances. He argues that without the pinpoint instruction there is a reasonable  
20 likelihood the jury did not understand the defense and could consider all factors in the  
21 instructions as mitigation.

22 The state supreme court considered and rejected this subclaim on direct appeal, stating  
23 that:

24 Defendant complains that the court erred in rejecting his instructions discussing  
25 his childhood and background, that were required to augment the section 190.3,  
26 factor (k) instruction. We disagree. The jury was fully aware that it could consider  
27 defendant’s childhood in mitigation under factor (k); it was further instructed that  
28 this factor allowed the jury to consider “any sympathetic or other aspect of the  
defendant’s character or record that the defendant offers as a basis for a sentence  
less than death.” In addition, the jury was instructed that it was “free to assign  
whatever moral or sympathetic value you deem appropriate to each and all of the

1 various factors" and that [t]o return a judgment of death, each of you must be  
2 persuaded that the aggravating evidence and/or circumstances is so substantial in  
3 comparison with the mitigating circumstances that it warrants death instead of life  
4 without parole." These instructions, combined with the arguments of Ryals  
5 (informing the jury it could consider as mitigating defendant's background and  
character) and Frank (telling jury that factor (k) includes any evidence of  
defendant's character or background that he offers), lead us to conclude that there  
is no possibility the jury misunderstood its sentencing obligation to consider  
defendant's background and character in determining the appropriate penalty.  
[Citation]

6

7 Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 82.

8 As recited above, in reviewing penalty phase instructions, the test is "whether there is a  
9 reasonable likelihood that the jury has applied the challenged instruction in a way that prevents  
10 the consideration of constitutionally relevant evidence." Boyd, 494 U.S. at 380. Further, a  
11 single instruction "may not be judged in artificial isolation," but must be considered in light of  
12 the instructions as a whole and the entire trial record. Estelle, 502 U.S. at 72.

13 Here, the state court could reasonably have found that the jury was not precluded from  
14 considering mitigating evidence including childhood and family evidence. The trial court  
15 rejected Petitioner's proffered special instruction, using instead CALJIC No. 8.84.1 (1986 rev.),  
16 which advised the jury to consider the circumstances of the present conviction (pursuant to Cal.  
17 Pen. Code § 190.3(a)) and any other extenuating circumstance and aspect of the defendant's  
18 character or record (pursuant to Cal. Pen. Code § 190.3(k)). (CT 994-995; RT 3087-3089.)  
19 Additionally, the prosecution argued to the jury that it was not precluded from considering  
20 mitigating evidence. (RT 3043-3044.) Defense counsel Frank did the same. (RT 3053-3060).

21 At the time Petitioner's conviction became final on October 7, 1996, it was established  
22 that use of CALJIC No. 8.84.1 was adequate to permit jurors to consider relevant mitigating  
23 evidence. Boyd, 494 U.S. at 381-82 (1990). The Ninth Circuit has rejected Petitioner's  
24 argument where, as here, the jury was advised it could consider any other mitigating matter. See  
25 Hendricks, 974 F.2d at 1109. The Supreme Court has never required a sentencing court to  
26 instruct a jury on how to weigh and balance factors in aggravation and mitigation. As discussed  
27 in the subclaims above, in Tuilaepa v. California, the Supreme Court stated, "[a] capital  
28

1 sentencer need not be instructed how to weigh any particular fact in the capital sentencing  
2 decision.” Tuilaepa, 512 U.S. at 979. Similarly, in Kansas v. Marsh, the Supreme Court stated:

3  
4 In aggregate, our precedents confer upon defendants the right to present  
5 sentencers with information relevant to the sentencing decision and oblige  
6 sentencers to consider that information in determining the appropriate sentence.  
The thrust of our mitigation jurisprudence ends here. “[W]e have never held that  
a specific method for balancing mitigating and aggravating factors in a capital  
sentencing proceeding is constitutionally required.”

7  
8 Marsh, 548 U.S. at 175 (quoting Franklin, 487 U.S. at 179) (citing Zant, 462 U.S. at 875–876,  
9 n.13). Petitioner has not made any sufficient evidentiary showing otherwise.

10 Respondent contends this subclaim is not cognizable because it creates and retroactively  
11 applies a “new rule” of constitutional law within Teague v. Lane, 489 U.S. 288. However, the  
12 Court finds the claim fails not because Petitioner seeks to apply a new rule of criminal procedure  
13 under Teague, but rather on grounds the claim lacks merit for the reasons stated.

14 For the reasons stated, the Court is persuaded the state court rejection of the subclaim  
15 was not contrary to, or an unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law, or an or  
16 an unreasonable determination of the facts in light of the evidence presented in the state court  
17 proceeding, viewed most favoring the prosecution. Jackson, 443 U.S. at 319. See 28 U.S.C. §  
18 2254(d).

19 This subclaim is denied.

20 *viii. Aggravation “Beyond a Reasonable Doubt” Instruction*

21 Petitioner alleges in the next subclaim that the trial court erred in denying his requested  
22 special instructions requiring the jury to find aggravation outweighed mitigation beyond a  
23 reasonable doubt and that a death sentence was appropriate beyond a reasonable doubt. The trial  
24 court instead gave the statutory instruction, CALJIC No. 8.84.2 (1986 rev.), renumbered CALJIC  
25 No. 8.88 (1989 rev.).

26 The state supreme court considered and rejected this claim on appeal, stating that:

27  
28 Defendant contends the trial court violated the federal Constitution by rejecting

1 his instruction that would have required the jury unanimously to find the existence  
2 of an aggravating factor before considering it and to find beyond a reasonable  
3 doubt that the aggravating factors outweighed the mitigating factors before  
4 choosing the penalty of death. Instead, the court instructed the jury pursuant to  
5 former CALJIC No. 8.84.2, which informed the jury it must “be guided by the  
6 applicable factors of aggravating and mitigating circumstances upon which [it]  
7 had been instructed.” The instruction also emphasized to the jury that the penalty  
8 determination did not involve a mere mechanical weighing process, but required  
9 an individual assessment of the aggravating and mitigating circumstances (and  
10 assignment of “whatever moral or sympathetic value” it deemed appropriate) in  
11 determining the sentence. Defendant claims CALJIC No. 8.84.2 failed to inform  
12 the jury it must find that the aggravating factors outweighed the mitigating factors  
13 and that, if it found mitigating factors outweighed aggravating factors, it must  
14 impose a sentence of life without parole. We have previously rejected these  
15 contentions, and defendant has failed to persuade us to reconsider our decisions.  
16 [Citation]

17 As we have previously recognized, nothing in the federal Constitution requires the  
18 jury unanimously to find the existence of an aggravating factor, or to find beyond  
19 a reasonable doubt that the People proved each aggravating factor, that the  
20 aggravating circumstances outweighed the mitigating ones, or that death is  
21 appropriate. [Citation] Unlike the determination of guilt, “the sentencing function  
22 is inherently moral and normative, not factual” [Citation] and thus “not  
23 susceptible to a burden-of-proof quantification.” [Citation] . . . Former CALJIC  
24 No. 8.84.2 adequately conveyed to the jury the seriousness of its obligation in  
25 determining the appropriate penalty, and we find no error in giving the  
26 instruction. [Citation]

27 Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 80-81.

28 Petitioner could correctly argue that “the Due Process Clause protects the accused against  
conviction except upon proof beyond a reasonable doubt of every fact necessary to constitute the  
crime with which he is charged.” In re Winship, 397 U.S. 358, 364 (1970). In California, for a  
defendant to be eligible for the death penalty, the jury must, beyond a reasonable doubt, find him  
guilty of murder in the first degree, and must find true one of the special circumstances set forth  
in Cal. Penal Code § 190.2. Tuilaepa, 512 U.S. at 975.

29 However, once a defendant is convicted, “the prosecution has no burden of proof that  
30 death is the appropriate penalty, or that one or more aggravating factors or crimes exist, in order  
31 to obtain a judgment of death.” People v. Anderson, 25 Cal. 4th 543, 589 (2001). Instead, the  
32 clearly established law at the time Petitioner’s conviction became final vested the jury with  
33

1 “unbridled discretion in determining whether the death penalty should be imposed after it has  
2 found that the defendant is a member of the class made eligible for that penalty.” Tuilaepa, 512  
3 U.S. at 979-80.

4 There is no Supreme Court authority which constitutionally requires that a jury be  
5 instructed on a burden of proof in the sentence selection phase in a capital case. Further, “[t]he  
6 United States Supreme Court has never stated that a beyond-a-reasonable-doubt standard is  
7 required when determining whether a death penalty should be imposed.” Harris, 692 F.2d at  
8 1195. Nor is there any Supreme Court authority which would require a burden of proof or  
9 persuasion be assigned to any of the jury’s penalty phase determinations. On the contrary, the  
10 Supreme Court has held that no “specific method for balancing mitigating and aggravating  
11 factors in a capital sentencing proceeding is constitutionally required.” Marsh, 548 U.S. at 175.  
12 California’s death penalty sentencing scheme has been consistently upheld as constitutional by  
13 the Supreme Court. Tuilaepa, 512 U.S. at 975-80; Pulley, 465 U.S. at 53.

14 The Court finds the statutory instruction, CALJIC 8.84.2, did appropriately advise the  
15 jury to consider the applicable factors of aggravating and mitigating circumstances and that to  
16 find for death each juror must be persuaded that the aggravating evidence and/or circumstances  
17 is so substantial in comparison with the mitigating circumstances that it warrants death instead of  
18 life without parole. (CT 1018; RT 3095-3096.) Due process requires no more. Harris, 692 F.2d  
19 at 1194. California is not required to adopt specific standards for instructing the jury on  
20 consideration of aggravating and mitigating circumstances. Zant, 462 U.S. at 890.

21 The state court then could reasonably find the requirement under California’s death  
22 penalty statute, that the jury weigh aggravating and mitigating factors before imposing the death  
23 penalty, adequately guarantees the jury’s discretion will be guided and its considerations  
24 deliberate.

25 Respondent contends this subclaim is not cognizable because it creates and retroactively  
26 applies a “new rule” of constitutional law within Teague v. Lane, 489 U.S. 288. However, the  
27 Court finds the claim fails not because Petitioner seeks to apply a new rule of criminal procedure  
28

1 under Teague, but rather on grounds the claim lacks merit for the reasons stated.

2 The Court finds that the state court rejection of the subclaim was not contrary to, or an  
3 unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law, or an unreasonable determination of  
4 the facts in light of the evidence presented in the state court proceeding, viewed most favoring  
5 the prosecution. Jackson, 443 U.S. at 319. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

6 This subclaim is denied.

7 *ix. Written Aggravation Findings*

8 Petitioner alleges in his next subclaim that the trial court erred in not instructing the jury  
9 to make written findings as to aggravating and mitigating factors, denying him due process and  
10 meaningful appellate review under the Eighth Amendment.

11 The state supreme court reviewed and rejected this claim on direct appeal, noting that:

12 Defendant contends the trial court erred by failing to require the jury to render  
13 written findings on the aggravating factors it selected. We have repeatedly held  
14 that such findings are not required, and accordingly, find no error. [Citation]

15 Federal law is in accord. See Harris, 692 F.2d at 1195, overruled on other grounds  
465 U.S. 37 (1984).

16 Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 82.

17 The state court decision is not contrary to Supreme Court precedent. See Harris, 692  
18 F.2d at 1195–96. Moreover, the California procedure provides a sufficient record for appellate  
19 review by requiring the judge to provide a written statement upholding or overturning the jury’s  
20 verdict without requiring written findings by the jury on the aggravating circumstances. In  
21 Proffitt v. Florida, the Supreme Court upheld the Florida death penalty statute which was  
22 comparable to California’s procedure. 428 U.S. 242, 250-251 (1976). In the Florida statute, the  
23 jury is required to make a penalty recommendation to the trial judge, unaccompanied by any  
24 specific findings, and thereafter the judge determines the actual sentence and specifies in writing  
25 the reasons in support of the sentence. Id. at 249-250. In interpreting the Florida law, the  
26 Supreme Court emphasized, “Since . . . the trial judge must justify the imposition of a death  
27 sentence with written findings, meaningful appellate review of each such sentence is made

28

1 possible . . . ." Id. at 251. In a similar way, the California procedure provides for meaningful  
2 appellate review with respect to the disclosure of the reasons supporting a sentence of death.

3 The California procedure was approved by the Supreme Court in Pulley v. Harris, where  
4 it was stated:

5  
6 If the jury finds the defendant guilty of first degree murder and finds at least one  
7 special circumstance, the trial proceeds to a second phase to determine the  
8 appropriate penalty. Additional evidence may be offered and the jury is given a  
9 list of relevant factors. § 190.3. "After having heard all the evidence, the trier of  
10 fact shall consider, take into account and be guided by the aggravating and  
11 mitigating circumstances referred to in this section, and shall determine whether  
12 the penalty shall be death or life imprisonment without the possibility of parole." Ibid. If the jury returns a verdict of death, the defendant is deemed to move to  
13 modify the verdict. § 190.4(e). The trial judge then reviews the evidence and, in  
14 light of the statutory factors, makes an "independent determination as to whether  
15 the weight of the evidence supports the jury's findings and verdicts." Ibid. The  
16 judge is required to state on the record the reasons for his findings. Ibid. If the  
17 trial judge denies the motion for modification, there is an automatic appeal. §§  
18 190.4(e), 1239(b). The statute does not require comparative proportionality  
19 review or otherwise describe the nature of the appeal. [Footnote omitted.] It does  
20 state that the trial judge's refusal to modify the sentence "shall be reviewed." §  
21 190.4(e). This would seem to include review of the evidence relied on by the  
22 judge. As the California Supreme Court has said, "*the statutory requirements that  
the jury specify the special circumstances which permit imposition of the death  
penalty, and that the trial judge specify his reasons for denying modification of  
the death penalty, serve to assure thoughtful and effective appellate review,  
focusing upon the circumstances present in each particular case.*" People v.  
Frierson, 25 Cal.3d 142, 179, 158 Cal. Rptr. 281, 302, 599 P.2d 587, 609 (1979).

17  
18 . . .

19 The jury's "discretion is suitably directed and limited so as to minimize the risk of  
20 wholly arbitrary and capricious action." Gregg, 428 U.S., at 189, 96 S. Ct., at  
21 2932. Its decision is reviewed by the trial judge and the State Supreme Court. On  
its face, this system, without any requirement or practice of comparative  
proportionality review, cannot be successfully challenged under Furman and our  
subsequent cases.

22 Pulley, 465 U.S. at 51-53 (emphasis added).

23 Respondent contends this subclaim is not cognizable because it creates and retroactively  
24 applies a "new rule" of constitutional law within Teague v. Lane, 489 U.S. 288. However, the  
25 Court finds the claim fails not because Petitioner seeks to apply a new rule of criminal procedure  
26 under Teague, but rather on grounds the claim lacks merit for the reasons stated.

27 For the reasons stated, the Court finds that the state court rejection of the subclaim was  
28

1 not contrary to, or an unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law, or an or an  
2 unreasonable determination of the facts in light of the evidence presented in the state court  
3 proceeding, viewed most favoring the prosecution. Jackson, 443 U.S. at 319. See 28 U.S.C. §  
4 2254(d).

5 This subclaim is denied.

6 x. Proportionality

7 Petitioner next alleges that the California death penalty statute fails to require intra-case  
8 and inter-case proportionality and to provide for meaningful proportionality review, denying him  
9 protection from arbitrary imposition of the death penalty and denying him equal protection with  
10 non-capital felons and preventing the jury from considering all mitigation factors.

11 The state supreme court considered and rejected this subclaim on appeal, finding that:

12 Defendant complains that the lack of intra-case and inter-case proportionality  
13 review in this case renders the 1978 sentencing scheme under California's death  
14 penalty law arbitrary under the Eighth Amendment and in violation of his equal  
15 protection rights because such review is afforded to noncapital defendants. We  
have rejected the argument in numerous cases. [Citation]

16 Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th 83.

17 Generally, errors of state law are not cognizable on federal habeas. Estelle, 502 U.S. at  
18 67. If a challenged instruction, viewed in the context of the overall charge, shows a denial of  
19 due process which renders the trial unfair, habeas relief may lie. See Cupp, 414 U.S. at 147;  
20 Henderson v. Kibbe, 431 U.S. 145, 154 (1976). A claim that instructional error violates a  
21 defendant's constitutional rights depends on the evidence and the overall instructions.  
22 Villafuerte v. Stewart, 111 F.3d 616, 624 (9th Cir. 1997).

23 In this instance, the state court could reasonably find Petitioner's intra-case and inter-case  
24 proportionality subclaim to be foreclosed by the Supreme Court's decision in Pulley, 465 U.S.  
25 37. In Pulley, the high court reviewed California's death penalty procedure, and in particular,  
26 considered the fact that California did not require any sort of comparative proportionality review.  
27 Id. The Supreme Court found that the Eighth Amendment did not require a "state appellate

1 court, before it affirms a death sentence, to compare the sentence in the case before it with the  
2 penalties imposed in similar cases if requested to do so by the prisoner.” Id. at 43-44. Further,  
3 the Supreme Court held that “[o]n its face, [California’s] system, without any requirement or  
4 practice of comparative proportionality review, cannot be successfully challenged under Furman  
5 [v. Georgia, 408 U.S. 238 (1972)] and our subsequent cases.” Id. at 53.

6 In order to satisfy constitutional requirements, a death penalty law must narrow the class  
7 of death-eligible defendants, and provide for individualized penalty determination. McCleskey  
8 v. Kemp, 481 U.S. 279, 308 (1987). California’s 1978 death penalty meets these requirements,  
9 People v. Rodriguez, 42 Cal.3d 730, 777-779 (1986), and has been upheld as constitutional by  
10 the United States Supreme Court. Ramos, 463 U.S. at 993-94. The federal court has rejected  
11 proportionality review, Pulley, 465 U.S. at 53. So has the California Supreme Court. People v.  
12 Cox, 53 Cal.3d 618, 692 (1991), disapproved on other grounds by People v. Doolin, 45 Cal.4th  
13 390, 417 (2009).

14 Respondent contends this subclaim is not cognizable because it creates and retroactively  
15 applies a “new rule” of constitutional law within Teague v. Lane, 489 U.S. 288. However, the  
16 Court finds the claim fails not because Petitioner seeks to apply a new rule of criminal procedure  
17 under Teague, but rather on grounds the claim lacks merit for the reasons stated.

18 The Court finds that the state court rejection of the subclaim was not contrary to, or an  
19 unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law, or an unreasonable determination of  
20 the facts in light of the evidence presented in the state court proceeding, viewed most favoring  
21 the prosecution. Jackson, 443 U.S. at 319. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

22 This subclaim is denied.

23 xi. Conclusions

24 For the reasons discussed in the subclaims above, the state court could reasonably have  
25 found that Petitioner failed to establish state court rejection of claim 58 was contrary to, or an  
26 unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law, or an or an unreasonable  
27 determination of the facts in light of the evidence presented in the state court proceeding, viewed  
28

1 most favoring the prosecution. Jackson, 443 U.S. at 319. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

2 Claim 58, including all its subclaims, is denied.

3 **r. Review of Claim 59<sup>11</sup>**

4 In his next claim, Petitioner alleges that the trial court, during the (Cal. Pen. Code §  
5 190.4(e)) automatic motion to independently review the evidence, erred by failing to consider  
6 mitigating evidence when imposing death.

7 The state supreme court considered and rejected this claim on direct appeal, stating that:

8  
9 Defendant contends the trial court committed prejudicial error in denying his  
10 automatic motion for modification of the death sentence (§ 190.4, subd. (e))  
because it failed to consider mitigating evidence of defendant's dysfunctional  
family and his kindness to his siblings (§ 190.3, factor (k)). We are not persuaded.

11 After reviewing section 190.3, factors (a)-(i), and concluding that several statutory  
12 mitigating factors did not apply to defendant, (the court did note that defendant  
may have been high on PCP during the murders pursuant to factor (h)), the court  
13 asked: "Are there other circumstances that mitigate against the aggravation of the  
[defendant], I think not." Moreover, before denying the modification motion, the  
14 court stated that it had considered defendant's motion to reduce penalty and the  
15 People's response, both of which referred to defendant's mitigating evidence.  
Thus, although the court did not specifically mention defendant's mitigating  
16 evidence of his family life, the court's statement regarding section 190.3, factor  
17 (k) evidence shows it considered all pertinent penalty phase evidence, including  
18 testimony about defendant's family life and his behavior toward his siblings, but  
merely found it unpersuasive. The record is clear that in ruling on the motion for  
modification, the trial court independently assessed the weight of the evidence  
under each factor, and stated its reasons for denying defendant's motion. [Citation]  
We conclude on this record that all constitutional and statutory considerations  
19 were observed in the court's ruling. [Citation]

20 Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 83.

21 At the time Petitioner's conviction became final, Cal. Penal Code § 190.4(e) provided  
22 that:

23 In every case in which the trier of fact has returned a verdict or finding imposing  
the death penalty, the defendant shall be deemed to have made an application for  
24 modification of such verdict or finding pursuant to Subdivision 7 of Section 11. In  
ruling on the application, the judge shall review the evidence, consider, take into  
25 account, and be guided by the aggravating and mitigating circumstances referred  
to in Section 190.3, and shall make a determination as to whether the jury's  
findings and verdicts that the aggravating circumstances outweigh the mitigating  
26 circumstances are contrary to law or the evidence presented. The judge shall state  
on the record the reasons for his findings.

27  
28 <sup>11</sup> The legal basis of the Fifth and Sixth Amendment were stricken as unexhausted. ECF No. 60 at 9:9-10.

1       The judge shall set forth the reasons for his ruling on the application and direct  
2       that they be entered on the Clerk's minutes. The denial of the modification of the  
3       death penalty verdict pursuant to subdivision (7) of Section 1181 shall be  
4       reviewed on the defendant's automatic appeal pursuant to subdivision (b) of  
5       Section 1239. The granting of the application shall be reviewed on the People's  
6       appeal pursuant to paragraph (6).

5       Cal. Penal Code § 190.4(e).

6       Petitioner alleges that the trial court, during the (Cal. Pen. Code § 190.4(e)) automatic  
7       motion to modify and independently review of the evidence, did not mention and thus ignored  
8       much 190.3(k) mitigating evidence of his abysmal childhood, adolescence in an alcoholic,  
9       violent and dysfunctional family and his love and loyalty toward siblings, when it imposed the  
10       death penalty following its independent review. (CT 1103; RT [10/ 27-31, 1988] at pp. 2-16.)  
11       He claims the trial judge was not guided by aggravating and mitigating circumstances in  
12       upholding death and thus failed to comply with the mandate of California Penal Code § 190.4(e).

13       The death penalty is constitutional if it "is imposed only after a determination that the  
14       aggravating circumstances outweigh the mitigating circumstances present in the particular crime  
15       committed by the particular defendant, or that there are no such mitigating circumstances."  
16       Blystone, 494 U.S. at 305. To the extent automatic modification under California's capital  
17       sentencing statute was part of the manner by which California fulfills its constitutional duty to  
18       tailor and apply its death sentencing scheme in a rational manner, see Pulley, 465 U.S. at 52, the  
19       evidentiary record shows the trial court reviewed the verdict, considered and discussed the  
20       aggravating and mitigating circumstances and factors and made an individualized determination  
21       of whether death was the proper punishment. RT [10/31/88] pp. 7-10; see Turner v. Calderon,  
22       281 F.3d 851, 871 (9th Cir. 2002). The California Supreme Court's conclusion that the trial  
23       court's review was proper under state law is binding on this Court. Wainwright v. Goode, 464  
24       U.S. 78, 84 (1983) (per curiam).

25       The Court finds this claim raises solely an issue of state law without any claimed  
26       constitutional error, Estelle, 502 U.S. at 68, leaving the federal court unable to review it. As  
27       noted, habeas relief does not lie for errors of state law. Estelle, 502 U.S. at 67; Pulley, 465 U.S.  
28

1 at 41 (“A federal court may not issue the writ on the basis of a perceived error of state law.”).  
2 Petitioner’s claim that the trial court incorrectly conducted its review of the jury’s sentencing  
3 verdict is not cognizable on federal habeas. See Turner, 281 F.3d at 871. The Supreme Court  
4 has not held that such a review is required, and the high court has found California’s review  
5 procedure to be constitutional. Pulley, 465 U.S. at 51-53.

6 Respondent contends this claim is not cognizable because it creates and retroactively  
7 applies a “new rule” of constitutional law within Teague v. Lane, 489 U.S. 288. However, the  
8 Court finds the claim fails not because Petitioner seeks to apply a new rule of criminal procedure  
9 under Teague, but rather on grounds the claim lacks merit for the reasons stated.

10 For the reasons stated, the Court finds that the state court rejection of the claim was not  
11 contrary to, or an unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law, or an unreasonable  
12 determination of the facts in light of the evidence presented in the state court proceeding, viewed  
13 most favoring the prosecution. Jackson, 443 U.S. at 319. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

14 Claim 59 is denied.

15 **s. Review of Claim 60**

16 In his penultimate claim, Petitioner alleges that the cumulative effect of constitutional  
17 error during the penalty phase warrants habeas relief. He cites to and incorporates claims 36-59  
18 and argues cumulative error therefrom.

19 The state supreme court considered and rejected this claim on direct appeal, stating that:

20  
21 Defendant claims that in combination, the errors at the penalty phase caused  
22 cumulative prejudice warranting a reversal of penalty. After review of the record,  
23 we disagree. Any prosecutorial misconduct that did occur did not significantly  
24 influence the fairness of defendant’s trial or detrimentally affect the jury’s  
determination of the appropriate penalty. [Citation]

25 Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 84.

26 The California Supreme Court also summarily denied claim 60 (SPet. Claim WW) as  
27 raised in Petitioner’s state petition for habeas corpus. In re Sanchez, S049502 (DD).

28 Claims 36-59, *ante*, each fail for the reasons discussed above. Petitioner then cannot

1 make a sufficient showing that he was prejudiced by defense counsel's cumulative  
2 ineffectiveness during the penalty phase. The state court could reasonably have found that  
3 Petitioner failed to show the cumulative effect of alleged penalty phase errors deprived him of  
4 due process. These claims are insubstantial when considered cumulatively. See Karterman, 60  
5 F.3d at 580; see also Rupe, 93 F.3d at 1445.

6 Respondent contends this claim is not cognizable because it creates and retroactively  
7 applies a "new rule" of constitutional law within Teague v. Lane, 489 U.S. 288. However, the  
8 Court finds the claim fails not because Petitioner seeks to apply a new rule of criminal procedure  
9 under Teague, but rather on grounds the claim lacks merit for the reasons stated.

10 Accordingly, the Court finds that a fair-minded jurist could have found that Petitioner  
11 failed to establish that the state court rejection of the claim was contrary to, or an unreasonable  
12 application of, clearly established federal law, or an or an unreasonable determination of the facts  
13 in light of the evidence presented in the state court proceeding, viewed most favoring the  
14 prosecution. Jackson, 443 U.S. at 319. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

15 Claim 60 is denied.

16 **t. Review of Claim 61**

17 In his final claim, Petitioner alleges that his death sentence is grossly disproportionate  
18 given his actions, his merely vicarious culpability as an aider and abetter, and his severe  
19 neurological and psychiatric impairments, violating his rights under the Eighth and Fourteenth  
20 Amendments.

21 The state supreme court considered and rejected this claim on direct appeal, stating that:

22  
23 Defendant contends his death sentence is disproportionate to his culpability under  
24 the Eighth Amendment and article I, section 17 of the California Constitution,  
25 which preclude punishment that is disproportionate to a defendant's individual  
26 culpability. [Citation] Defendant complains that the constitutional proscription  
against a disproportionate penalty has been especially violated in this case because  
his accomplices in the murders received either 25 years to life pursuant to a  
negotiated plea (Robert Reyes), or had the charges dismissed on insufficient  
evidence grounds (Joey Bocanegra).

27 Defendant relies on People v. Dillon (1983) 34 Cal.3d 441, 479, in which the  
28 court reduced a life sentence imposed on a 17-year-old with no prior convictions

1 for a noncapital first degree felony murder to a sentence for second degree  
2 murder. But, as we have subsequently stated, Dillon does not mandate the type of  
3 intra-case proportionality review sought by defendant. See People v. Hill, 3  
Cal.4th 959, 1013 (1992).

3 As the People observe, intra-case proportionality review is “an examination of  
4 whether defendant's death sentence is proportionate to his individual culpability  
5 irrespective of the punishment imposed on others.” People v. Adcox, 47 Cal.3d  
6 207, 274 (1987). “The Eighth Amendment to the federal Constitution does not  
7 require us to incorporate into our proportionality determination any comparison of  
8 defendant's sentence with that of another culpable person, whether charged or  
9 uncharged.” Hill, 3 Cal.4th at p. 1014; Pulley, 465 U.S. 37, 53 (1984) [upholding  
10 California's absence of comparative proportionality review].)

11 Accordingly, we reject defendant's plea for “intra-case proportionality.” The  
12 evidence shows that he committed three brutal first degree murders of innocent  
13 and defenseless victims as an accomplice, only thirty-three days after he was  
14 released from state prison on parole from an eight-year prison term imposed for  
15 two violent assaults. In light of the evidence presented at trial, the penalty is  
16 proportionate to defendant's culpability. [Citation]

17 Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 84-85.

18 The California Supreme Court also denied claim 61 (SHCP Claim XX) raised in  
19 Petitioner's state petition for habeas corpus. In re Sanchez, S049502 (DD).

20 Petitioner purports to question the viability of Pulley. Yet he does not explain how and  
21 why the Pulley decision is infirm, or provide any authority showing that it is. Instead he argues  
22 simply that Pulley should not be applied to him because his liability was only vicarious and he is  
23 actually innocent of the charged murders.

24 The claim is not persuasive. Petitioner does not provide any sufficient basis for  
25 questioning the holding in Pulley or its application in his proceeding. Pulley was clearly  
26 established authority at the time Petitioner's conviction became final on October 7, 1996.

27 Petitioner does not distinguish or limit application of Pulley based on facts of this case.  
28 Petitioner alleges his death sentence is disproportionate because the more culpable Reyes and  
29 Joey were not sentenced to death. However, this argument cannot succeed given that there is no  
30 federal proportionality requirement. Pulley, 465 U.S. 37. The Supreme Court held that “[o]n its  
31 face, [California's] system, without any requirement or practice of comparative proportionality  
32 review, cannot be successfully challenged under Furman [v. Georgia, 408 U.S. 238 (1972)] and  
33 our subsequent cases.” Id. at 53. California's 1978 death penalty has been upheld as

1 constitutional by the United States Supreme Court. Ramos, 463 U.S. at 993-94. The federal  
2 court has rejected proportionality review, Pulley, 465 U.S. at 53, as has the California Supreme  
3 Court. Cox, 53 Cal.3d at 692. Moreover, the state court could reasonably find Petitioner's death  
4 sentence is not disproportionate to his culpability given the facts and circumstances of the crimes  
5 and his involvement in the crimes. (See claims 1-4 and subclaim "x" of claim 58, *ante*.)

6 Petitioner alleges that his death sentence is disproportionate given California's  
7 extraordinarily large death pool. The Eighth Amendment requires that a state capital sentencing  
8 system must: "1) rationally narrow the class of death-eligible defendants; and 2) permit a jury to  
9 render a reasoned, individualized sentencing determination based on a death-eligible defendant's  
10 record, personal characteristics, and the circumstances of his crime." Marsh, 548 U.S. at 173-74.  
11 As noted in claim 58, subclaim "x", it was established at the time Petitioner's conviction became  
12 final that California's system complied with these requirements. Pulley, 465 U.S. at 53-54.  
13 Petitioner has not shown that Pulley does not control this case.

14 Petitioner's re-argument of actual innocence fails for the reasons discussed in claims 2  
15 and 4, *ante*.

16 In sum, the Court finds this claim is entirely foreclosed by Pulley. Therein, the Supreme  
17 Court determined that the Eighth Amendment did not require a "state appellate court, before it  
18 affirms a death sentence, to compare the sentence in the case before it with the penalties imposed  
19 in similar cases if requested to do so by the prisoner." Pulley, 465 U.S. at 43-44. The California  
20 Supreme Court, applying state law, rejected Petitioner's intra-case proportionality argument,  
21 stating that:

22  
23 The evidence shows that he committed three brutal first degree murders of  
24 innocent and defenseless victims as an accomplice, only thirty-three days after he  
25 was released from state prison on parole from an eight-year prison term imposed  
for two violent assaults. In light of the evidence presented at trial, the penalty is  
proportionate to defendant's culpability.

26 Sanchez, 12 Cal.4th at 84-85. The Bocanegra murders in which Petitioner participated were  
27 violent, progressed over a period of time, and were bloody. (RT 2731, 2733, 2735-2736, 2739-

1 2741, 2747-2749, 2752-2753, 2756, 2790-2797, 2799-2806, 2808-2820, 2829-2830, 2833-2834.)  
2 The Tatman murder in which Petitioner participated involved massive blunt force blows to the  
3 chest during a violent assault and stabbing. (RT 2646, 2650-2651, 2655, 2688-2695, 2718, 2842,  
4 2846-2848, 2860.) Petitioner has not shown a reasonable probability that his sentence was  
5 grossly disproportionate to the crimes, see Hamelin v. Michigan, 501 U.S. 957, 959 (1991), so as  
6 to deny him a fair trial and a more favorable outcome.

7 Accordingly, for the reasons discussed above, the Court finds that the state court rejection  
8 of the claim was not contrary to, or an unreasonable application of, clearly established federal  
9 law, or an or an unreasonable determination of the facts in light of the evidence presented in the  
10 state court proceeding, viewed most favoring the prosecution. Jackson, 443 U.S. at 319; see 28  
11 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

12 Claim 61 is denied.

13 **VII.**

14 **MOTION FOR EVIDENTIARY HEARING**

15 On March 18, 2003, Petitioner filed a motion seeking an evidentiary hearing on claims 2,  
16 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37,  
17 38, 40, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 50, 51, 52, 54 and 60. (ECF No. 120.) Petitioner alleges in his  
18 motion that the state supreme court denied him a full and fair evidentiary hearing to resolve the  
19 following facts showing prejudice, facts that were not presented at trial because of ineffective  
20 assistance of counsel and prosecutorial misconduct:

21 1) Jailhouse informant Seeley's statements, disclosed to the defense prior to trial but not  
22 presented at trial by either side, that Reyes, the third person at the Bocanegra crime scene,  
23 confessed to a more culpable role in Mr. Bocanegra's murder, that Petitioner played no part in  
24 killing Mr. Bocanegra, and that Reyes admitted being the initial aggressor against Mrs.  
25 Bocanegra.

26 2) Inconsistencies between the physical evidence and jailhouse informant Hernandez's  
27 testimony at trial where he wanted to trade information for favorable treatment, exaggerated the  
28

1 amount of time he spoke to Petitioner about the crime, failed to admit he was arrested for being  
2 under the influence of heroin, and failed to admit he had been a heroin addict for over five years.

3       3) Principal perpetrator Joey Bocanegra's violent temper, substance abuse through the  
4 night and early morning before killing his parents, history of requesting money for drugs from  
5 his parents and becoming violent if they refused his request.

6       4) Testimony by prosecution witnesses, the crime scene analyst and the forensic  
7 pathologist, supporting Petitioner's defense that Reyes was Joey's main assistant in the  
8 Bocanegra murders.

9       5) Petitioner's severe organic brain damage, low IQ, and serious psychiatric disorders,  
10 known to defense counsel before trial but not investigated and presented at trial.

11       6) Defense counsel's unreasonable acquiescence in the prosecution's use of statements  
12 Petitioner made to Detectives Stratton and Boggs which should have been excluded under  
13 Miranda, and to reporter Trihey which should have been placed in context and shown they were  
14 inconsistent with an inference that he intended to kill.

15       Respondent filed his opposition on July 18, 2003, arguing that an evidentiary hearing is  
16 not warranted because the claims lack merit, there is no sufficient offer of proof, and the new  
17 evidence presented by Petitioner does not cast doubt on the California Supreme Court's finding  
18 that Petitioner failed to set forth facts which constitute a constitutionally cognizable claim. (ECF  
19 No. 137.) Petitioner filed a reply on September 19, 2003, re-arguing his position on the motion.  
20 (ECF No. 140.)

21       Section 2254(d), as amended by the AEDPA, provides:

22       An application for a writ of habeas corpus on behalf of a person in custody  
23 pursuant to the judgment of a State court shall not be granted with respect to any  
24 claim that was adjudicated on the merits in State court proceedings unless the  
adjudication of the claim--

25           (1) resulted in a decision that was contrary to, or involved an unreasonable  
application of, clearly established Federal law, as determined by the  
Supreme Court of the United States; or

26           (2) resulted in a decision that was based on an unreasonable determination  
of the facts in light of the evidence presented in the State court proceeding.

1 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

2 In Cullen v. Pinholster, the Supreme Court held that “review under § 2254(d)(1) is  
3 limited to the record that was before the state court that adjudicated the claim on the merits,” and  
4 thus “evidence introduced in federal court has no bearing on § 2254(d)(1) review.” Pinholster,  
5 131 S. Ct. at 1398, 1400. Although the central holding of Pinholster pertained to § 2254(d)(1),  
6 the Supreme Court observed that “§ 2254(d)(2) includes the language ‘in light of the evidence  
7 presented in the State court proceeding,’” providing “additional clarity” that review under §  
8 2254(d)(2) is also limited to the record before the state court. Id. at 1400 n.7. Therefore, for  
9 claims that were adjudicated on the merits in state court, Petitioner can only rely on the record  
10 that was before the state court to satisfy the requirements of § 2254(d). See Landigan, 550 U.S.  
11 at 474.

12 Petitioner seeks an evidentiary hearing on the forty-one claims set forth above. All of  
13 those claims were adjudicated on the merits in the state court. See Richter, 562 U.S. at 99  
14 (“[w]hen a federal claim has been presented to a state court and the state court has denied relief,  
15 it may be presumed that the state court adjudicated the claim on the merits in the absence of any  
16 indication or state-law procedural principles to the contrary). For the reasons stated above,  
17 Petitioner fails to demonstrate that any of the forty-one claims overcomes the limitation of §  
18 2254(d). Thus, Pinholster effectively bars a habeas court from any further factual development  
19 on these claims. Id. at 1411 n.20.

20 Petitioner further claims that he is entitled to a hearing under 28 U.S.C. § 2254(e)(2).  
21 Pinholster suggests this is not so. “Section 2254(e)(2) continues to have force where §  
22 2254(d)(1) does not bar federal habeas relief.” Id. at 1401. Analysis of the claims under §  
23 2254(d) must precede the granting of an evidentiary hearing under § 2254(e)(2). Id. Thus, only  
24 if Petitioner overcomes § 2254(d) can the Court consider a hearing under § 2254(e)(2). As  
25 Justice Breyer stated: “If the federal habeas court finds that the state-court decision fails [§  
26 2254](d)’s test (or if [§ 2254](d) does not apply), then an [§ 2254](e) hearing may be needed.”  
27 Id. at 1412 (Breyer, J., concurring in part and dissenting in part).

28

1 As discussed above, § 2254(d) applies to all forty-one claims since they were adjudicated  
2 on the merits, and Petitioner fails to overcome § 2254(d) with respect to any of the forty-one  
3 claims.

4 For the reasons stated, Petitioner's motion for evidentiary hearing shall be denied.

VIII.

## **MOTION AND RENEWED MOTION TO PRESERVE TESTIMONY**

7 On June 25, 2014, Petitioner filed a motion to preserve testimony by deposing the  
8 following seven witnesses:

	Name	Case Relation	Age
9	Theodore S. Donaldson	Trial Defense Psychiatrist	87
10	Eugene F. Toton	Lead Trial Defense Attorney	78
11	Patricia L. McGregor	Trial Defense Investigator	70
12	Maria E. Valenzuela	Friend of victim, Mrs. Bocanegra	68
13	Susan M. Peninger	Trial Defense Investigator	67
14	Jeri A. Doane	Post-conviction Psychologist	67
15	David V. Foster	Post-conviction Psychologist	67
16			

17 Each of these individuals previously filed a declaration in support of the instant petition. (ECF  
18 No. 150.)

19 Petitioner argues good cause to preserve evidence because these witnesses are of  
20 advanced age and their proposed testimony will be probative of the claimed ineffective  
21 assistance of counsel, mental defenses, and Petitioner’s actions and lack of culpability, as alleged  
22 in the petition. Respondent filed his opposition on August 27, 2014, arguing there is no good  
23 cause for such relief because Petitioner is not entitled to an evidentiary hearing, and even if he  
24 were, there is no showing of the probity of proposed testimony or that these witnesses would be  
25 unavailable. (ECF No. 154.) Moreover, Respondent states his need for further discovery should  
26 the motion be granted. Petitioner replied on September 3, 2014, re-arguing good cause to  
27 preserve testimony relating to declarations of these aged witnesses already on file, and stating

1 that further discovery needs of Respondent can be litigated after the motion to preserve evidence  
2 is granted.

3 On May 1, 2015, Petitioner filed a motion renewing the pending motion to preserve  
4 testimony. (ECF No. 160.)

5 A judge may authorize discovery and may limit it under the Federal Rules of Civil  
6 Procedure upon a showing of the reasons for the request and good cause. Rules Governing §  
7 2254 Cases, Rule 6. Discovery should be allowed if it will help illuminate issues underlying  
8 applicant's claim. Gaitan-Campanioni v. Thornburgh, 777 F. Supp. 1355, 1356 (E.D. Tex.  
9 1991). Availability of discovery during habeas is vested in the sound discretion of the district  
10 court. Campbell v. Blodgett, 982 F.2d 1356, 1358, (9th Cir. 1993).

11 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 27 provides in pertinent part that:

12 The court where a judgment has been rendered may, if an appeal has been taken  
13 or may still be taken, permit a party to depose witnesses to perpetuate their  
14 testimony for use in the event of further proceedings in that court.

15 The party who wants to perpetuate testimony may move for leave to take the  
16 depositions, on the same notice and service as if the action were pending in the  
district court. The motion must show:

17 (A) the name, address, and expected substance of the testimony of each deponent;  
18 and  
19 (B) the reasons for perpetuating the testimony.

20 If the court finds that perpetuating the testimony may prevent a failure or delay of  
21 justice, the court may permit the depositions to be taken and may issue orders like  
22 those authorized by Rules 34 and 35. The depositions may be taken and used as  
any other deposition taken in a pending district-court action.

23 This Rule does not limit a court's power to entertain an action to perpetuate testimony and  
24 may be used in habeas proceedings. Calderon v. U.S. Dist. Court for Northern Dist. of  
25 California, 144 F.3d 618, 621 (9th Cir. 1998); accord Martin v. Reynolds Metals Corp., 297 F.2d  
26 49, 55 (9th Cir. 1961) (court has the power to order taking of deposition for purpose of  
perpetuating evidence).

27 Good cause under Rule 27 may be found “[w]here specific allegations before the court

1 show reason to believe that the petitioner may, if the facts are fully developed, be able to  
2 demonstrate that he is . . . entitled to relief . . . ." Bracy v. Gramley, 520 U.S. 899, 908-09 (1997),  
3 citing Harris v. Nelson, 394 U.S. 286, 300 (1969).

4 Here, the Court finds that Petitioner has not made a sufficient factual showing to establish  
5 good cause as required by Habeas Corpus Rule 6(a). Apart from age, Petitioner offers no facts  
6 suggesting unavailability of these witnesses or reasons why this testimony will be lost if not  
7 preserved. See Penn. Mut. Life Ins. Co., v. U.S., 68 F.3d 1371, 1373 (C.A.D.C. 1995). While  
8 age of the deponent may be relevant in determining whether there is sufficient basis to perpetuate  
9 testimony, Penn. Mut. Life Ins. Co., 68 F.3d at 1375, this Court, for purposes of this proceeding,  
10 does not find age alone a sufficient basis to grant relief. Even if it were, Petitioner supports  
11 probity of the proposed testimony only by citing generally to proposed deponents' declarations  
12 in the record. Petitioner does not state with sufficient specificity the expected substance of the  
13 testimony and how it would lead to evidence, admissible under AEDPA, relevant to claims in his  
14 petition and entitlement to relief. Petitioner has not made a sufficient showing that the proposed  
15 discovery would lead to relevant evidence likely to be lost. See Martin, 298 F.2d at 55.

16 In sum, nothing reasonably suggests a basis to believe the proposed testimony would lead  
17 to factual development showing entitlement to relief, and that the proposed testimony might  
18 otherwise be lost. See Bracy, 520 U.S. at 908-09; see also Gilday v. Callahan, 99 F.R.D. 308,  
19 309 (D.C. Mass. 1983) (no "good cause" under Rule 6 where the facts petitioner seeks to dispute  
20 had been resolved by state court).

21 For the reasons stated, Petitioner's motion to preserve evidence, as renewed, shall be  
22 denied.

## 23 IX.

### 24 MOTION FOR CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE

25 On May 1, 2015, Petitioner filed a motion requesting a case management conference to  
26 discuss any assistance the Court might require to resolve the pending motion for evidentiary  
27 hearing. (ECF No. 159.)

1 However, there is no need for a case management conference given the discussion above  
2 denying the motion for evidentiary hearing. The motion for case management conference shall  
3 be denied.

X.

**REQUEST TO SEAL AND PROTECT SUPPLEMENTAL LODGED DOCUMENTS**

6 On June 23, 2015, Respondent filed a request that the following documents be filed under  
7 seal and protected from disclosure: (1) the Request to Seal the November 25, 1987 Reporter's  
8 Transcript & Penal Code Section 987.9 Materials, totaling two (2) pages, (2) the November 25,  
9 1987 Reporter's Transcript (conditionally sealed Lodged Document # II), totaling Seven (7)  
10 pages, (3) all Penal Code Section 987.9 Materials (conditionally sealed Lodged Document #  
11 QQ), totaling ninety-five (95) pages, and (4) a [Proposed] Order Sealing the conditionally sealed  
12 Lodged Documents # II and # QQ), totaling one (1) page.

13 Respondent argues that these documents, sealed state court records, contain confidential  
14 information that should be protected from disclosure in this proceeding. Local Rule 141;  
15 California Penal Code Section 987.9(d).

16 The Court notes that Petitioner has been served with copies of these supplemental record  
17 documents. He has not opposed Respondent's request and the time for doing so has passed.  
18 Local Rule 141(c).

19 Documents may be sealed only by written order of the Court, upon the showing required  
20 by applicable law. Local Rule 141(a). Confidential information may be protected by a  
21 protective order. Local Rule 141.1(a)(1).

22 The Court has reviewed the request to seal and protect documents and the supplemental  
23 lodged documents, and based thereon finds good cause to grant the request.

24 The supplemental lodged documents, sealed and unsealed, were not considered by the  
25 Court in its analysis and disposition of the foregoing claims. The Court notes that these  
26 documents, to the extent they are evidence of trial counsel's defense of Petitioner, do nothing but  
27 support effective assistance by trial counsel and the Court's above analysis and disposition. (See

1 [Sealed] Supplemental Lodged Documents #II and #QQ.)

2 **XI.**

3 **CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY**

4 Because this is a final order adverse to the petitioner, Rule 11 of the Rules Governing  
5 Section 2254 Cases requires this court to issue or deny a Certificate of Appealability (“COA”).  
6 Accordingly, the Court has sua sponte evaluated the claims within the petition for suitability for  
7 the issuance of a COA. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c); Turner, 281 F.3d at 864–65 (9th Cir. 2002).

8 A state prisoner seeking a writ of habeas corpus has no absolute entitlement to appeal a  
9 district court's denial of his petition, and an appeal is only allowed in certain circumstances.  
10 Miller-El, 537 U.S. at 335–36 (2003). The controlling statute in determining whether to issue a  
11 COA is 28 U.S.C. § 2253, which provides as follows:

12 (a) In a habeas corpus proceeding or a proceeding under section 2255 before a  
13 district judge, the final order shall be subject to review, on appeal, by the court of  
appeals for the circuit in which the proceeding is held.

14 (b) There shall be no right of appeal from a final order in a proceeding to test the  
15 validity of a warrant to remove to another district or place for commitment or trial  
16 a person charged with a criminal offense against the United States, or to test the  
validity of such person's detention pending removal proceedings.

17 (c) (1) Unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability, an  
appeal may not be taken to the court of appeals from—

18 (A) the final order in a habeas corpus proceeding in which the detention  
complained of arises out of process issued by a State court; or

19 (B) the final order in a proceeding under section 2255.

20 (2) A certificate of appealability may issue under paragraph (1) only if the  
applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.

21 (3) The certificate of appealability under paragraph (1) shall indicate which  
specific issue or issues satisfy the showing required by paragraph (2).

22 The court may issue a COA only “if jurists of reason could disagree with the district  
23 court's resolution of his constitutional claims or that jurists could conclude the issues presented  
24 are adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further.” Miller-El, 537 U.S. at 327; Slack v.  
25 McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000). While the petitioner is not required to prove the merits of  
26

1 his case, he must demonstrate “something more than the absence of frivolity or the existence of  
2 mere good faith on his . . . part.” Miller-El, 537 U.S. at 338.

3 In the present case, the Court finds that, with respect to the following claims, reasonable  
4 jurists could disagree with the Court’s resolution or conclude that the issues presented are  
5 adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further:

6 1) Claim 8: Whether defense counsel provided ineffective assistance by failure to  
7 investigate and present testimony of jailhouse informant Charles Seeley.

8 2) Claim 59: Whether the trial court failed to consider Petitioner’s mitigations  
9 evidence when it imposed the death penalty.

10 3) Claim 61: Whether imposition of the death penalty is constitutionally  
11 disproportionate as to Petitioner.

12 Therefore, a certificate of appealability is granted as these three claims.

13 As to the remaining claims and requests for evidentiary hearing and to preserve  
14 testimony, the Court concludes that reasonable jurists would not find the Court’s determination  
15 that Petitioner is not entitled to relief debatable, wrong, or deserving of encouragement to  
16 proceed further. Petitioner has not made the required substantial showing of the denial of a  
17 constitutional right. He has not demonstrated good cause to preserve testimony. Accordingly,  
18 the Court hereby declines to issue a COA as to the remaining claims and requests for evidentiary  
19 hearing and to preserve testimony.

20 **XII.**

21 **ORDER**

22 Accordingly, for the reasons stated, it is HEREBY ORDERED that:

23 1. The Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (ECF No. 38) is DENIED,  
24 2. Petitioner’s motion for evidentiary hearing (ECF No. 120) is DENIED,  
25 3. Petitioner’s motion to preserve testimony (ECF No. 150) and renewed motion to  
26 preserve testimony (ECF No. 160) are DENIED,  
27 4. Petitioner’s motion for a case management conference (ECF No. 159) is  
28

1 DENIED.

2 5. Respondent's request to seal and protect supplemental lodged documents (ECF  
3 No. 162) is GRANTED such that:

4 a. The Clerk of the Court is directed to file under seal, (1) Petitioner's Request  
5 to Seal November 25, 1987 Reporter's Transcript & Penal Code Section 987.9  
6 Materials, totaling two (2) pages, (2) the November 25, 1987 Reporter's  
7 Transcript (conditionally sealed Lodged Document # II), totaling Seven (7)  
8 pages, (3) all Penal Code Section 987.9 Materials (conditionally sealed  
9 Lodged Document # QQ), totaling ninety-five (95) pages, and (4) a  
10 [Proposed] Order Sealing Supplemental Lodged Documents # II and # QQ),  
11 totaling one (1) page,

12 b. The above documents filed under seal and the information therein constitute  
13 confidential information which shall not be disclosed, in whole or part, to any  
14 person other than the Court and Court staff and individually named counsel  
15 for the parties for their use solely in connection with litigation of the habeas  
16 petition pending before this Court,

17 c. No publicly filed document shall include the above documents and/or the  
18 information therein unless authorized by the Court to be filed under seal, and

19 d. All provisions of this order shall continue to be binding after the conclusion  
20 of this habeas corpus proceeding and specifically shall apply in the event of a  
21 retrial of all or any portion of Petitioner's criminal case, except that either  
22 party maintains the right to request modification or vacation of this order.

23 6. A Certificate of Appealability is ISSUED as to the Court's resolution of claims 8,  
24 59 and 61,

25 7. A Certificate of Appealability is DECLINED as to claims 1-7, 9-58, and 60, and  
26 as to the requests for evidentiary hearing and to preserve testimony,

27 8. Any and all scheduled dates are VACATED, and

1       9. The Clerk of the Court is directed to substitute RON DAVIS, acting Warden of  
2       San Quentin State Prison, as the Respondent warden in this action, and to enter  
3       judgment accordingly.

4  
5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6 Dated: July 22, 2015

  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

10 SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE